DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 349 924 HE 025 854

AUTHOR	Altizer, Anne W.
TITLE	Seeking Major Gifts: How 57 Institutions Do It.
INSTITUTION	Council for Advancement and Support of Education, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-89964-287-X
PUB DATE	92
NOTE	172p.
AVAILABLE FROM	CASE RESOURCES, Suite 400, 11 Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036-1261 ($24 for members, $32 for nonmembers; prepaid).
PUB TYPE	Books (010) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Alumni; *Corporate Support; Donors; Educational Finance; *Educational Trends; Elementary Schools; Elementary Secondary Education; Financial Support; *Fund Raising; Higher Education; High Schools; *Income; *Philanthropic Foundations; Private Colleges; Private Schools; Public Colleges; School Funds
IDENTIFIERS	Alumni Relations; *Gifts

ABSTRACT

A study was done of how educational institutions seek major gifts in their fund raising strategies. The study surveyed 57 institutions in 4 major categories: private colleges (24), private universities (6), public universities (12), and private elementary/secondary schools (15). The study sought to discover whether significant changes had taken place since the last similar survey done in 1983. Findings indicated the following: (1) "major" is still the term of choice for larger gifts but the minimum level required for this category has risen to $25,000 for the largest number of institutions (21); (2) as in 1983, institutions receive gifts in several forms with the bulk of major gifts coming in cash or convertible securities; (3) of three categories of givers, individuals, foundations, and corporations, individuals give more than any other single category and of the individual donors, alumni give the greatest percentage; (4) public universities receive 28 percent of their major gifts from corporations and 20 percent from foundations; (5) foundations give more to the private universities than to other institutions; and (6) board members are important as a major source of gifts to independent elementary/secondary schools and private colleges. An appendix contains samples of the cover letter and major gifts survey. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED349924

Council for Advancement and Support of Education

Seeking Major Gifts: How 57 Institutions Do It

Compiled By Anne W. Altizer

HE025854

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CASE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

COUNCIL FOR ADVANCEMENT AND SUPPORT OF EDUCATION

SEEKING MAJOR GIFTS: HOW 57 INSTITUTIONS DO IT

COMPILED BY ANNE W. ALTIZER

(C) 1992 by the Council for Advancement and Support of Education

ISBN 0-89964-287-X

Printed in the United States of America.

In 1974, the American Alumni Council (founded in 1913) and the American College Public Relations Association (founded in 1917) merged to become the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE).

Today, approximately 2,900 colleges, universities, and independent elementary and secondary schools in the U.S. and 20 other countries belong to CASE. This makes CASE the largest nonprofit 501(c)(3) education association in terms of institutional membership. Representing the member institutions in CASE are more than 14,000 individual professionals in institutional advancement.

Nonprofit education-related organizations such as hospitals, museums, libraries, cultural or performing arts groups, public radio and television stations, or foundations established for public elementary and secondary schools may affiliate with CASE as Educational Associates. Commercial firms that serve the education field may affiliate as Subscribers.

CASE offers books, videotapes, and focus issues of the award-winning monthly magazine, CURRENTS, to professionals in institutional advancement. The books cover topics in alumni administration, communications and marketing, fund raising, management, and student recruitment. For a copy of the catalog, write to CASE RESOURCES, Suite 400, 11 Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036-1261. For more information about CASE programs and services, call (202) 328-5900.

Cover design by Craig McCausland

Council for Advancement and Support of Education
Suite 400, 11 Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036-1261

Contents

Foreword i

Introduction iii

1. An Overview of the Survey Results 1

   Survey Results: All Institutions 12

2. Private Colleges 47

   Survey Results: Private Colleges 56

3. Private Universities 81

   Survey Results: Private Universities 89

4. Public Universities 105

   Survey Results: Public Universities 113

5. Independent Elementary/Secondary Schools 131

   Survey Results: Independent Elementary/Secondary Schools 140

Appendix

   Cover Letter and Major Gifts Survey

Foreword

Today, as always, major gift cultivation and solicitation are the central and most visible endeavors in educational fund raising. In 1984 CASE published *Quest for Major Gifts*, Addison Winship's detailed survey of major gift fund-raising practices at a selected group of institutions. CASE is pleased to present this follow-up study, *Seeking Major Gifts: How 57 Institutions Do It*. We are grateful to Anne W. Altizer, coordinator of major and planned giving with the National 4-H Council and a graduate student at the University of Maryland College Park, who did the research for and wrote this monograph. We also appreciate the generosity of Marts & Lundy Inc. in underwriting its publication.

While CASE did not have the resources to survey a representative sample of its member institutions, Altizer invited responses from the same institutions Winship had surveyed, as well as new ones. This survey includes responses from 24 private colleges, six private universities, 12 public universities, and 15 private elementary/secondary schools. We chose to seek information from many institutions that have well-established major gift programs--as well as from those that are building such programs. The results contain valuable information for practitioners who want to know what other institutions, including ones with successful programs, are doing.

In the eight years since Winship's study was published, there have been significant changes in major gift fund raising. As you would expect, fund-raising practices and techniques have become more sophisticated. But I think you will also find, as often is the case, that the basics remain the same: Major gifts do not happen in a vacuum, but are the result of meaningful relationships established between individuals at the institution and prospective donors. The information in this study also points out the crucial role of the president, especially in securing the very largest gifts, as well as the growing importance of staff in the major gift process.

Peter McE. Buchanan
CASE President
May 1992

Introduction

Major gift fund raising is constantly evolving at schools, colleges, and universities. CASE last published a report on this subject in 1984, based on research done in 1983 by the late Addison L. Winship II, vice president emeritus at Dartmouth College.

The information that follows updates and expands Winship's research. This survey, the publication of which has been underwritten in part by a generous grant from the consulting firm of Marts & Lundy, examines a broad range of institutions in order to gain a comprehensive understanding of the major gift process.

This study collected like data from private colleges, private universities, public universities, and private elementary/ secondary schools. It attempts to report in an organized manner how these institutions staff their major gift programs and how they cultivate, solicit, and recognize major gifts, both in and out of a campaign. A set of questions also addresses policies for major gifts, endowments, and scholarships.

This study does not mean to suggest that major gift fund raising is the same across the board. Each institution has a unique set of circumstances and a unique body of alumni and other constituents, and of course these factors shape its major gift program. As you read this study, however, you will find that the techniques for raising major gifts are common to all institutions.

Development officers raise funds by establishing and nurturing long-term relationships between persons at their institutions--including themselves--and potential donors, then strengthening those relationships once donors make their gifts. As you read these data, remember that any gift received by a respondent institution was the result of personal ties between the donor and the people at the institution, whether the president or school head, deans, professors, or development officers. The bottom line is, as it's always been, "People give to people."

In developing the questionnaire, analyzing the resulting data, and writing this report, the author has had help from many people. Special thanks go to CASE Director of Research Judy Grace, CASE Book Editor Susan Hunt, and CASE President Emeritus Virginia Carter Smith for their support and assistance. And, of course, a salute to Marts & Lundy for underwriting the publication of this monograph.

Background

Major gift fund raising is no longer associated solely with capital campaigns; major gift programs are now part of most annual fund programs as well. Many institutions have created separate offices for major gift work. More people are involved with the major gift process than ever before, and more staff are actually soliciting the gift. While volunteers may not be as involved with the ask as they once were, they still play a vital role in opening doors to major gift prospects and involving them in the life of the institution.

In 1991, the author sent 162 surveys to CASE member institutions, including private colleges, private universities, public universities, and private elementary/secondary schools. (Even though independent is the preferred term these days, the author uses the word "private" for parallelism with the 1983 study.) Representatives of 57 institutions completed and returned the survey questionnaire. The objective was not to take a statistically random sampling of all institutions, but to invite responses from institutions Winship included in his study, to supplement that list somewhat, and to survey more public institutions than in the 1983 study.

Chapter 1 compares the data from the four categories of institutions with each other and with Winship's 1983 results. The ensuing chapters analyze the data for each institutional category. The detailed survey results for each category follow the analysis, and a compilation of the data for all responding institutions follows

the overview in Chapter 1. Often, answers to a particular question may have such a wide range (1 to 100 percent, for example) that averages are not as meaningful as they might be. You will, therefore, find it helpful to refer to the data as you read the analyses.

To give you a complete picture of the study process, the appendix includes a copy of the survey and the cover letter.

As you read the data for each category, you will notice that individual answers are not attributed to specific institutions as in Winship's survey. The reason is that the author did this survey also as part of master's thesis research at the University of Maryland College Park. Research protocols there require that responses be anonymous.

Most experts agree that the overall success of a fund-raising program depends primarily on major gifts. The author hopes that knowing how other institutions conduct their programs can help educational development officers evaluate and improve their own approaches to major gift fund raising.

Chapter 1

An Overview of the Survey Results

In 1983 the late Addison L. Winship II conducted the study published by CASE in 1984 as *Quest for Major Gifts*. The survey reported here is meant not only to update Winship's work, but to compare his results to what is happening today. Have there been significant changes in major gift fund raising? The results of this study indicate some changes but also some striking similarities between major gift fund raising today and in 1983.

Winship gathered data from a total of 68 institutions in seven categories--private secondary schools (17 respondents), private men's colleges (one respondent), private women's colleges (four respondents), private coeducational colleges (25 respondents), private universities (10 respondents), public universities (eight respondents), and professional schools (three respondents).

The 1991 study received responses from 57 institutions in four major categories--private colleges (24 respondents), private universities (six respondents), public universities (12 respondents), and private elementary/secondary schools (15 respondents).

The 1991 survey followed the earlier study in general, but included additional questions. The analysis in this chapter follows the order of the 1991 survey, and a compilation of the 1991 figures for all the institutional categories appears at the end of this chapter.

Major gifts defined

In 1983, the respondent institutions reported that "major" denoted larger gifts, usually $10,000 or more. In 1991 "major" is still the term of choice, but the minimum level required for this category of gift has risen to $25,000 for the largest number of institutions (21). Ten now use $100,000 as a minimum, and 13 continue to use $10,000. Two-thirds of the respondents report having changed their minimum gift requirement--almost all upward--since 1983.

In 1983, the respondent institutions accepted their major gifts in the form of cash, securities, in-kind donations, and through a variety of planned instruments. Respondents in 1991 also received gifts in these forms, with cash being the major form for all four categories of institutions. Only independent schools reported a substantial percentage (40 percent) received in stocks. When it came to other forms, private colleges receive the largest percentage (23 percent) in planned instruments; private universities are close behind at 18 percent.

Where are the gifts coming from? The 1983 survey found that respondents received major gifts (not surprisingly) from these sources: individuals, foundations, and corporations. The 1991 question on this topic was phrased differently. In 1991, respondents estimated the percentages received from each of the individual donor sources (alumni, parents, and nonalumni/friends) and from corporations and foundations.

In the four institutional categories, individuals (alumni, parents, and nonalumni/friends combined) gave more than any other single category, and of the individual donors, alumni gave the greatest percentage. Independent schools received 86 percent of their major gifts from individuals--63 percent from alumni, 19 from parents, and 4 from nonalumni/friends. Private colleges received 74 percent of their major gifts from individuals--49 percent from alumni, 20 from nonalumni/friends, and 5 from parents. Private universities were not much different: They received 59 percent of their major gifts from individuals--38 percent from alumni, 19 percent from nonalumni/friends, and 2 percent from parents.

Public universities, however, received over one-fourth (28 percent) of their major gifts from corporations and another 20 percent from foundations. Even so, individuals (alumni, 30 percent; nonalumni/friends, 20 percent; parents, less than 1 percent) were the largest single source of major gifts at public universities as well.

Foundations gave more to the private universities surveyed (23 percent) than to the public universities (20 percent), private colleges (20 percent), or independent schools (12 percent).

Board members were more important as a source of major gifts to independent elementary/secondary schools (25 percent) and private colleges (24 percent) than to private universities (6 percent) or public universities (5 percent).

The 1983 survey asked whether major gifts could be made in the form of outright gifts, trusts, and bequests. Most of the responding institutions accepted gifts in all three forms, but did not indicate the percentages. In 1991 respondents reported the percentages of major gifts received in cash or convertible securities and in the following planned instruments: pooled income fund, lead trusts, charitable remainder trusts, and bequests.

The results show that the bulk of the major gifts came in cash or convertible securities--ranging from 73 percent of the major gifts at independent elementary/secondary schools to 44 percent at private universities. All types of institution received small amounts from charitable remainder trusts, lead trusts, and pooled income funds. Bequests were a more important source of major gifts at private universities (20 percent) and colleges (19 percent) than at independent schools (13 percent) or public universities (8 percent).

Major gift research

The 1983 study did not survey methods of prospect research, perhaps because this area was not as well developed then as now. However, the 1991 survey sought to determine how institutions identify their major gift prospects. In 1991, 33 of the 57 institutions said that prospect research was very important to their major gift programs; 20 felt it was important; four said it was somewhat important; and no institution said prospect research was not important to their major gift program.

The 1991 survey examined the use of four methods of prospect research:

* *referral*: gathering names of prospects as well as information about them from informal sources (board members, current donors, alumni, etc.) who volunteer information or are asked for it by staff ("word of mouth" falls under this category);

* *geodemographic screening*: matching names of current or potential donors to a database containing socioeconomic and lifestyle data, and using this data to identify prospects of varying philanthropic potential;

* *internal prospect research*: an organized staff effort to use many different sources (surveys, interviews, proxy statements, land records, directories, news reports, and so on) to identify and evaluate prospects; and

* *field screening*: the process of using knowledgeable individuals (often alumni and parents) in various geographic areas to review, identify, and evaluate prospects from those areas.

The institutions could also write in other methods if appropriate.

The results indicate that internal prospect research was the most important method used by three categories of institutions; it was used to identify an average of 51 percent of the independent school prospects, 44 percent of the private college prospects, 33 percent of the public university prospects, and 26 percent of the private university prospects.

Private universities used field screening more than any other method; it helped these institutions identify 51 percent of their prospects, almost twice as many as internal prospect research (26 percent). Field screening was less effective for private colleges (26 percent), public universities (22 percent), and independent schools (16 percent). The relatively new method of geodemographic research was used to identify 9 percent of the prospects at private colleges, 8 percent at public universities, 4 percent at independent schools, and 1 percent at private universities in the study.

The size of the prospect research staff helps determine what prospect research methods an institution will use. In 1991 three-quarters of the institutions responding have staff members specifically charged with doing major gift prospect research; they range from one staff researcher to nine. More than half of the institutions (36 of 57) feel that they do not have enough research help. Most of the institutions (all but 12) have a computerized system in place to track major gift prospects.

The 1991 survey asked respondents what percentage of their major gift prospects were evaluated and rated by volunteers, staff and volunteers, and staff alone. Most institutions in the study use staff or staff working with volunteers to rate most of their prospects. Staff working alone (without volunteers) rate 56 percent of the prospects at public universities, 47 percent at private colleges, 46 percent at private universities, and 37 percent at independent schools. Staff working with volunteers evaluate and rate these percentages of prospects: independent schools (60 percent), private colleges (51 percent), private universities (42 percent), and public universities (36.5 percent). The most significant use of volunteers to rate prospects is at private universities, which rely heavily on field screening sessions in which volunteers are deeply involved.

As in 1983, about half of the 1991 respondents are engaged in a campaign. All institutions (those that are and that are not now in a campaign) report having an intense major gifts program when they are currently in a campaign; this activity drops off more than one year out of a campaign.

Major gift staffing and solicitation

In 1983, 58 percent of the respondents had one or more major gift professionals. In 1991, the number had risen to 74 percent. As in 1983, the larger institutions report having more professionals on staff. However, since 1983, more independent schools have begun hiring specialists in major gift fund raising. Ten of 15 independent schools in the survey reported that they have one to three prospect researchers on staff.

The 1983 survey asked institutions that did not have a major gift office to indicate who took the responsibility for that function. Their responses, in descending order of importance, were as follows:

* president or head;
* director of development;
* trustees/board chair;
* vice president of development, chair of development committee, key volunteers;
* development, field staff;
* deans;
* faculty, fund-raising consultant, librarian, foundation vice president and legal counsel, assistant head for external affairs.

Most of the 1991 respondents reported that major gift activity is conducted in an Office of Major/Planned Gifts or in separate offices for these two functions. Most of those that did not have a major gift professional on staff said that the vice president for development, the director of development, or a development officer handled major gift fund raising.

In 1983 most of the institutions in a campaign reported that they intended to keep their major gift officer at the conclusion of the campaign. In 1991, only slightly over half of the 30 institutions in campaigns (17) were planning to keep all of their major gift staff at the conclusion of the campaign; another nine hadn't yet decided.

In 1991 major gift and development officers manage many donors and prospects. At only 4 percent of the institutions do the officers manage 10 or fewer donors and prospects; at 25 percent of the institutions, they manage 11 to 50 prospects; at 29 percent of the institutions, 51 to 100 donors and prospects; at 27 percent it's 101 to 200; and at 15 percent it's over 200.

In 1983, respondents rated on a one-to-nine scale the degree of major gift success in terms of dollars raised by those involved in the institution's fund-raising program. The 1983 ranking was as follows (descending order):

* president/head;
* senior development officer;
* development committee chair, other trustees, board chair;
* other development committee members, deferred gift officer;
* major gift development officer; and
* deans.

The 1991 study included a similar question in which respondents used a one-to-five scale (with five being the greatest responsibility) to rate the major gift responsibility held by the president or head, the chief development officer, deans, the major gift officer, development officers, trustees, volunteers, and faculty.

In 1991 the chief development officer very slightly edged out the president or school head as the person most responsible for securing a major gift. The weighted average for chief development officer was 4.7 compared to 4.6 for the president/school head. Next came the major gift officer(s) with a weighted average of 4.1, followed by trustees (3.6), development officers (3.5), and volunteers (3.4). The two groups of persons least responsible for securing a major gift were deans with a weighted average of 2.3 and faculty members, 1.8.

Independent schools, however, rated the president/school head and trustees slightly more responsible than the chief development officer in securing major gifts. Here the weighted average was 4.7 for president/school head, 4.2 for trustees, and 3.4 for the chief development officer and for volunteers.

Private colleges ranked volunteers and trustees fourth and fifth respectively, and private universities ranked trustees fourth and other volunteers sixth (tied with development officers). Public universities put them lower--volunteers were fifth (tied with deans) and trustees seventh, only slightly more involved in major gift fund raising than faculty members.

Quest for Major Gifts reported in 1983 that 39 percent of the major gifts obtained in recent years were secured by volunteers and 38 percent by presidents. In 1991, volunteers were still the leading source at independent schools where they secured almost half (46 percent) of the major gifts, but the development staff secured the highest percentage for the other three categories, bringing in 46 percent at public universities, 41 percent at private colleges, and 39 percent at private universities. The president or head was the second greatest source for all four institutional categories--38 percent at private universities, 37 percent at private colleges, 28 percent at public universities, and 26 percent at independent schools.

As professional staffs have grown in size and sophistication over the years, volunteer involvement seems to have changed. As detailed above, the 1991 survey indicates that trustees and volunteers are slightly less effective compared to staff than in 1983 in securing major gifts. Yet 86 percent of the 1991 respondents reported that their use of volunteers has increased by an average of more than 50 percent since 1983. Only seven institutions reported a decrease. One probable explanation is that, instead of working alone, volunteers and trustees now may be more likely to work in teams with presidents/school heads and development staff (see next page). Another is that volunteers and trustees now may be used more in the identification and cultivation phases rather than in actually securing gifts.

When the 1991 respondents listed the very largest major gifts in the last five years, they reported that over a third were secured by the president or head alone and over a third by the president or head working on a team with someone else--often a trustee or the chief development officer. Obviously, the key role paid by the campus chief executive underscores the importance of fund raising in the president's portfolio of duties.

Other key players in securing the three very largest gifts were trustees--including board chairs, chairs of development/resources committees, and campaign chairs--(active in 22 percent of the gifts), the chief development officer (involved in 9 percent), and the vice president or director of development (active in 6 percent and 3 percent respectively).

In 1983, the respondents indicated that over half of their major gift solicitations were made by at least two solicitors. In 1991, 46 of 57 respondents (over four-fifths) usually send more than one solicitor on major gift calls. In 1983 by far the most successful combination was the president or head with a trustee. In 1991, however, 16 institutions reported sending the chief development officer with the president or head, and 16 send the president and a trustee.

Endowment program

Major gift fund raising is often used to raise money for endowments and facilities. In 1983, $670,000 was the average minimum for an endowed professorship, and almost a fourth of the respondents (15 of 66) were asking $1 million or more. By 1991, exactly half (27 of 54 institutions) required a million or more as the minimum for an endowed professorship.

In 1983, almost two-thirds of the respondent institutions reported that the minimum level for an endowed professorship was negotiable; by 1991 fewer than half of the institutions (43 percent) were willing to negotiate the minimum. As in 1983, the negotiations varied, but the institution's relationship with the donor and the potential for future gifts from that donor were key factors.

Both surveys asked respondents at what point they would fill an endowed professorship. About one-third of the 1983 respondents filled the chair only when the endowment was fully funded. Over half of the 1991 respondents (53 percent) required that the endowment be fully funded before their institutions would fill the position.

In 1983, almost one-fourth of the institutions were willing to fill a chair for a gift subject to life income at the time of the gift. By 1991 this percentage had dropped to 15 percent. In 1983 only three of 50 institutions were willing to fill a chair for a documented bequest provision at the time of the bequest. By 1991, there were only two institutions of 48 willing to do this.

The institutions in both surveys market a wide range of options for endowments. In 1983 minimum endowments ranged from $5,000 to $1.5 million. In 1991 the dollar requirements ranged from $5,000 to $3 million. As you review the 1991 listings of the endowments and the minimum requirements, notice the similarity between the listings of the different institutional categories, not only in subject but in required endowments amounts as well.

Naming opportunities

The final section of both surveys explored naming opportunities for capital projects and other institutional priorities. In the 1991 survey, 96 percent of the respondents reported that they have capital or other naming opportunities, and 60 percent of these institutions have policies regarding naming opportunities.

In 1983, more than two-thirds (68 percent) of the respondents required a gift of at least 50 percent of the cost of the building in order to name it. The 1991 percentage was slightly higher: 70 percent required that the donor cover at least 50 percent of the total cost in order to name the building.

In 1983, 42 percent of the respondents included an endowment for operating and/or maintenance in pricing a building. In 1991, only 31 percent of the respondents included long-term maintenance in their projections.

Is capital fund raising getting easier as institutions hire more staff and begin to do more sophisticated prospect research? In 1983, 40 percent of the responding institutions found it more difficult than in the past; 36 percent thought it was easier; and 23 percent found it about the same. In 1991, the institutions within each category responded differently. Only one category, private colleges, found it harder to raise funds for capital projects now than in 1983: 11 private colleges found it harder while six of these institutions found it easier, and five found it about the same. Among 14 independent schools respondents, nine said it was about the same, four thought it easier, and only one considered it more difficult. The majority--nine--of 12 public universities also considered it about the same; two thought it more difficult, and only one said it was easier. Three private universities said it was about the same, and three said it was more difficult.

Conclusion

Survey results appear to indicate that little has changed in the technical side of major gift raising. In 1983, staff were heavily involved in major gift solicitation, as they are today. Volunteer involvement has not decreased but rather has changed its focus. Gift levels are on the rise since 1983, which probably relates directly to inflation and the economic boom of the late 1980s, and this appears to have had a positive impact on major gift philanthropy.

A comparison of the results from the different institutional types shows that major gift fund-raising efforts at the independent schools surveyed appear to be quite sophisticated and on a level with those of a small college. Even so, these schools generally have smaller staffs and rely more on trustees and volunteers than do colleges and universities.

The chapters that follow give more details about the four types of institutions covered in the 1991 survey.

All Institutions

MAJOR GIFTS DEFINED

1. **What word best describes your larger gifts?** (57 respondents)

Major:	35
Leadership:	16
Special:	3
Other:	
Strategic:	1

NOTE: One university uses "Principal" for the top category $5,000,000 and above, "Leadership" for $1,000,000-$5,000,000, and "Major" for $100,000-$1,000,000. Another uses "Principal" for $1,000,000 and above, "Major" for $250,000-$1,000,000, and "Leadership" for $50,000-$250,000.

2. **What is the minimum gift that qualifies for your lowest major gifts category?** (57 respondents)

$25,000:	21
$50,000:	6
$100,000:	10
Other:	
$1,000 -	2
$5,000 -	3
$10,000 -	13
$17,000 -	1
$20,000 -	1

3. **Has your definition of major gifts levels changed since 1983?** (56 respondents)

Yes:	37
No:	19

4. **If yes, what was your previous definition?** (36 respondents)

No previous definition:	8
$1,000:	1
$1,000-$10,000:	1
$5,000:	2
$10,000:	11
$10,000-$15,000	1
$15,000-$25,000:	1
$25,000:	2
$50,000:	2

Not sure, probably $50,000:	1
Life insurance, gift-in-kind, estate gift levels raised:	1
Major Gifts, $25,000-$50,000; Principal, $5,000,000+:	1
Not clearly defined except endowed gifts:	1
Increased the amount of a planned gift from $15,000 to $50,000:	1
In process of being raised:	1
Century Club ($100):	1

5. **What percentage of your major gifts do you receive in each of the following forms?** (54 respondents)

Cash:	10% - 1
	15% - 1
	20% - 3
	25% - 1
	30% - 1
	35% - 1
	39.1% - 1
	40% - 5
	50% - 4
	55% - 2
	56% - 1
	58% - 1
	60% - 3
	62% - 1
	64.52% - 1
	65% - 2
	68% - 1
	69% - 2
	70% - 3
	73% - 2
	75% - 4
	79% - 1
	80% - 4
	81% - 1
	85% - 2
	85.1% - 1
	90% - 3
	99.56% - 1
Stocks:	0% - 2
	.16% - 1
	1% - 1
	3% - 1
	3.5% - 1
	4% - 1
	5% - 2
	6.8% - 1
	7% - 2

	7.5% - 1
	8% - 1
	10% - 11
	11% - 1
	15% - 2
	18% - 1
	20% - 8
	22% - 1
	23.62% - 1
	25% - 2
	28% - 1
	30% - 1
	35% - 1
	39% - 1
	40% - 2
	50% - 1
	55% - 1
	60% - 1
	70% - 1
	75% - 2
	89% - 1
In-kind:	0% - 26
	.09% - 1
	.2% - 1
	.5% - 1
	1.6% - 1
	2% - 3
	2.46% - 1
	3% - 5
	4% - 1
	5% - 7
	6% - 1
	7% - 1
	8% - 1
	9% - 1
	10% - 2
	15% - 1
Planned instruments:	0% - 8
	.19% - 1
	1% - 1
	3% - 2
	5% - 7
	6.5% - 1
	7% - 1
	9.41% - 1
	10% - 10
	11% - 1
	15% - 1
	16% - 1
	18% - 1
	20% - 2
	21% - 1

23.8% - 1
25% - 2
30% - 4
36% - 1
40% - 1
50% - 1
53.4% - 1
60% - 2
70% - 1

Other: Real estate (2 at 1%; 1 at 5%); credit cards; varies from year to year

6. **What percentage is received from:** (55 respondents)

Alumni:

0% - 1
6.5% - 1
8% - 2
8.9% - 1
13% - 1
14% - 2
16% - 2
20% - 3
22% - 2
26% - 1
30% - 1
36% - 1
39% - 1
42% - 1
44% - 1
44.5% - 1
48% - 1
50% - 6
53.2% - 1
55% - 3
60% - 5
62% - 4
66% - 1
69.1% - 1
70% - 1
75% - 3
77.2% - 1
80% - 2
82% - 1
84% - 1
85% - 1
87% - 1

Parents:

0% - 16
.5% - 1
.6% - 1
.8% - 1
1% - 6

	1.5% - 1
	2% - 1
	2.1% - 1
	3% - 2
	5% - 3
	6% - 1
	7% - 1
	8% - 1
	10% - 6
	11% - 1
	13% - 1
	14% - 1
	15% - 3
	20% - 2
	25% - 1
	30% - 3
	33% - 1
Nonalumni/friends:	0% - 8
	.5% - 1
	1% - 1
	3% - 1
	5% - 5
	6% - 2
	9% - 1
	10% - 5
	10.9% - 1
	11.9% - 1
	12% - 1
	13% - 2
	13.4% - 1
	14% - 1
	15% - 4
	16% - 1
	17% - 1
	19% - 2
	20% - 3
	23% - 1
	25% - 1
	28% - 2
	30% - 2
	32% - 1
	33% - 1
	40% - 1
	43% - 1
	49% - 1
	54% - 1
	75% - 1
Corporations:	0% - 10
	.8% - 2
	1% - 5
	1.5% - 1
	2% - 2

	3% - 4
	4% - 1
	4.8% - 1
	5% - 7
	8% - 2
	10% - 7
	11% - 2
	14% - 1
	22% - 1
	30% - 1
	34% - 2
	39.5% - 1
	41% - 1
	41.1% - 1
	41.3% - 1
	50% - 1
	60% - 1
Foundations:	0% - 2
	1% - 3
	2% - 1
	3% - 1
	4% - 2
	5% - 5
	8.4% - 1
	10% - 6
	11.3% - 1
	12% - 1
	13% - 2
	14% - 1
	15% - 6
	19% - 1
	19.2% - 1
	20% - 7
	25% - 1
	28% - 1
	30% - 1
	30.4% - 1
	35% - 2
	37% - 1
	40% - 2
	43% - 1
	50% - 1
	51% - 1
	55% - 1
	80% - 1
Other:	0% - 10
	1% - 1
	2% - 1
	5.6% - 1
Government:	22.9% - 1

7. What percentage is received from:

Board members:	0% - 4
	1% - 2
	2% - 2
	4% - 1
	5% - 4
	6% - 2
	9% - 1
	10% - 7
	11% - 1
	12.6% - 1
	13% - 1
	15% - 5
	16% - 2
	18% - 1
	20% - 5
	23% - 1
	25% - 3
	27.4% - 1
	30% - 3
	35% - 1
	40% - 2
	50% - 1
	60% - 1
	80% - 1
	Confidential - 1
Former board:	0% - 14
	< 1% - 2
	1% - 7
	1.4% - 1
	2% - 6
	3% - 1
	5% - 4
	6.8% - 1
	10% - 6
	15% - 3
	16% - 1
	16.3% - 1
	18% - 2
	20% - 2
	25% - 1
	N/A - 2

8. Of the major gifts received, what percentage comes in the form of the following: (54 respondents)

a) Pooled income fund:	0% or see "f" - 31
	.01% - 1
	.05% - 2
	.15% - 1
	.6% - 1

	1% - 1
	2% - 4
	3% - 2
	4% - 3
	5% - 4
	9% - 1
	10% - 2
	20% - 1
b) Lead trusts:	0% or see "f" - 43
	.2% - 1
	1% - 3
	2% - 1
	3% - 4
	2.5% - 1
	20% - 1
c) Charitable remainder trusts:	0% or see "f" - 24
	.1% - 1
	.5% - 1
	1% - 3
	2% - 2
	3% - 4
	4% - 1
	5% - 6
	9% - 2
	9.4% - 1
	9.5% - 1
	10% - 4
	17% - 1
	22% - 1
	36.7% - 1
	52.2% - 1
d) Bequests:	0% or see "f" - 9
	.75% - 1
	1% - 4
	5% - 6
	6% - 1
	7% - 1
	8% - 1
	9.2% - 1
	10% - 7
	12% - 1
	15% - 1
	16% - 2
	19% - 1
	20% - 4
	25% - 1
	26% - 1
	27.6% - 1
	30% - 4
	31% - 1

32% - 1
33% - 1
33.1% - 1
50% - 1
59% - 1
92% - 1

e) Cash or convertible securities: 0% or see "f" - 8
14.7% - 1
25.6% - 1
28% - 1
30% - 1
40% - 1
48% - 1
56.2% - 1
58.5% - 1
60% - 2
61% - 1
62% - 1
65% - 1
66% - 1
70% - 7
75% - 1
76% - 1
78% - 1
80% - 5
82% - 1
83% - 1
84% - 1
85% - 2
88% - 1
90% - 4
91% - 1
95% - 2
98% - 3
99% - 1

f) Combination: 0% or see "f" - 35
2% - 1
2.4% - 1
4% - 1
5% - 2
7% - 1
8% - 1
10% - 2
13% - 1
20% - 1
48% - 1
100% - 7

g) Other: Real estate, in-kind: 0% - 51
3% - 1
5.5% - 1
15% - 1

9. **If the answer is "f," please indicate your estimated percentage received as:** (13 respondents)

a) Cash:	30% - 1 50% - 3 65% - 1 75% - 1 90% - 5 92% - 1 92% - 1 95% - 1
b) Planned instruments:	70% - 1 50% - 3 35% - 1 25% - 1 10% - 5 8% - 1 5% - 1

Other comments:

MAJOR GIFT RESEARCH

10. **How important do you consider prospect research to be in your major gifts?** (57 respondents)

Very important:	33
Important:	20
Somewhat important:	4
Not important:	0

11. **Approximately what percentage of your major gifts prospects was identified by each method?** (56 respondents)

Referral:	0% - 5 3% - 1 5% - 8 10% - 20 15% - 3 20% - 6 25% - 2 30% - 1 35% - 1 40% - 2 50% - 1 60% - 1 75% - 1 80% - 1 90% - 1 95% - 1 100% - 1

Geodemographic screening:	0% - 33
	5% - 8
	10% - 5
	15% - 4
	30% - 2
	35% - 1
	40% - 2
	50% - 1
Internal prospect research:	0% - 2
	5% - 6
	10% - 7
	15% - 1
	20% - 6
	25% - 2
	30% - 4
	35% - 1
	40% - 3
	45% - 2
	50% - 5
	65% - 2
	70% - 1
	75% - 2
	80% - 3
	90% - 6
	95% - 1
	100% - 2
Field screening:	0% - 13
	2% - 1
	5% - 4
	10% - 9
	15% - 1
	20% - 2
	25% - 3
	30% - 3
	35% - 3
	40% - 5
	50% - 3
	60% - 4
	75% - 1
	80% - 3
	85% - 1
Other: Miscellaneous:	5% - 2
	20% - 1
Luck:	15% - 1
Long-time accumulation:	40% - 1
Ongoing relationships:	75% - 1
Marketing:	80% - 1
Staff knowledge:	80% - 1

12. **What is the size of your prospect research staff?**
(57 respondents)

None:	14
1-3:	33
4-6:	7
7-9:	3
10 or more:	0

13. **Do you feel that you have adequate research help?**
(57 respondents)

Yes:	21
No:	36

14. **Do you have a computerized system for tracking prospects?**
(57 respondents)

Yes:	45
No:	12

15. **Please rate the intensity of your major gifts effort by circling the appropriate number:** (56 respondents)

In a campaign:	
Very intense:	39
Intense:	10
Somewhat intense:	2
Not intense:	0
Not ranked:	5
First year out of campaign:	
Very intense:	8
Intense:	12
Somewhat intense:	15
Not intense:	7
Not ranked:	14
More than one year out:	
Very intense:	7
Intense:	15
Somewhat intense:	14
Not intense:	12
Not ranked:	8

16. **Approximately what percentage of your major gifts prospects are evaluated and rated by:** (57 respondents)

Volunteers:	0% - 39
	5% - 3
	10% - 11
	25% - 2
	30% - 1
	55% - 1
Staff:	0% - 15
	5% - 1
	10% - 2
	20% - 2
	25% - 3
	30% - 2
	40% - 2
	44% - 1
	50% - 3
	60% - 1
	65% - 3
	70% - 2
	75% - 3
	80% - 5
	90% - 6
	95% - 1
	100% - 5
Staff with volunteers:	0% - 6
	5% - 2
	10% - 4
	15% - 2
	18% - 1
	20% - 4
	25% - 6
	35% - 1
	40% - 4
	50% - 2
	55% - 1
	60% - 4
	70% - 1
	75% - 2
	80% - 1
	95% - 1
	100% - 15
Other: Electronic screening:	2% - 1

MAJOR GIFTS STAFFING AND SOLICITATION

17. Is your major gift operation structured as: (49 respondents)

a) Office of Major Gifts:	6
b) Office of Major/Planned Gifts:	22
c) Separate offices for each category:	19
Other: All in one office:	2

18. If separate offices, describe briefly how planned giving interfaces with other major gift work.

- "We have a director of major gifts who reports to the director of development."
- "Major gifts officer trained in planned giving; planned giving director hitherto served as technical adviser when required; maintained separate program for his prospects."
- "Director of planned giving is considered a key member of the major gifts team (director of major gifts plus five major gifts officers); director of planned giving reports to director of development. Director of planned giving gets prospects by referral from major gifts officers; serves as in-house consultant."
- "[The offices work together] very directly--the director of planned giving also does major gifts work of various types."
- "Work in close cooperation."
- "Each regional advancement officer (six) is responsible for major gifts cultivation and solicitation within his or her region."
- "Major gifts officers go to planned giving staff with requests for specific information for a specific donor/prospect."
- "Planned gifts staff are lawyers and handle referrals from major gifts field officers as well as receiving direct inquiries."
- "Directors of development in the schools are the major gifts staff. A director of planned giving supports them."
- "Planned giving officer serves as a support resource."
- "We have a director of planned giving and one associate vice president for development who handle major gifts."
- "No separate officer of major/planned gifts exists. All senior officers are constantly aware of gift aspect that can optimize the act of the major donor."
- "One director of major gifts and one assistant director of major gifts; one director of planned giving and one half-time planned giving staff member. Both areas have been expanded in the last year."
- "Planned giving director attends all major gifts staff and prospect review meetings; full coordination on all prospects and solicitation strategies."
- "All major gifts flow through alumni and development; we're not large enough for a separate division."
- "They have joint duties in several instances."
- "The planned giving officer works with constituent development officers to coordinate strategies of major gifts prospects."
- "Planned giving is included in major gifts reviews. Computer tracking is

integrated. Offices are integrated under the executive director of development."
- "Prospects are assigned to each office; sometimes there is a double ask."
- "The planned giving officer keeps the major gifts officer updated. The planned giving officer is primarily responsible for cultivation, solicitation, negotiation. The major gifts officer is responsible for receipts processing."
- "Activities are coordinated with development officers and chief development officers. Manages a few major gifts prospects, but primarily supports development officers/management."

19. **Do you have one or more major gifts officers currently working in your office?** (57 respondents)

Yes:	42
No:	15

20. **If yes, how many?** (42 respondents)

1-3:	26
4-6:	10
7-9:	3
10 or more:	3

21. **If no, who is responsible for staffing major gifts?**

Head and Director of Development:	1
Director of Development:	6
Development Officers in each unit/school:	1
Vice President for Development:	4
Executive Director of Development:	1
Director, Institutional Advancement:	1
Acting Director of Development:	1
Associate Vice President for Development:	1

22. **How many major gifts donors and prospects are managed by one development officer?** (55 respondents)

10 or fewer:	2
11-50:	14
51-100:	16
101-200:	15
over 200:	8

23. **Are you currently in a campaign?** (56 respondents)

Yes:	30
No:	26

24. **If yes, did you hire or increase your major gifts staff at the start of the campaign?** (30 respondents)

Yes:	24
No:	6

25. **Will you retain your current level of major gifts staffing at the completion of your campaign?** (30 respondents)

Yes:	17
No, will reduce it:	4
No, will eliminate it:	0
Don't know yet:	9

26. **To what degree is each person responsible for securing a major gift?** (56 respondents)

President (weighted average, 4.6):	
1:	0
2:	3
3:	3
4:	9
5:	41
Not ranked:	0
Chief development officer (4.7):	
1:	0
2:	1
3:	3
4:	10
5:	41
Not ranked:	1
Dean (2.3):	
1:	18
2:	12
3:	12
4:	6
5:	3
Not ranked:	5
Major gifts officer (4.1):	
1:	2
2:	4
3:	5
4:	11
5:	23
Not ranked:	11

Development officers (3.5):	
1:	2
2:	6
3:	17
4:	20
5:	7
Not ranked:	4
Trustees (3.6):	
1:	0
2:	11
3:	13
4:	17
5:	14
Not ranked:	1
Volunteers (alumni or other) (3.4):	
1:	1
2:	9
3:	23
4:	14
5:	9
Not ranked:	0
Faculty member (1.8):	
1:	24
2:	21
3:	6
4:	2
5:	1
Not ranked:	2

27. **Of your institution's top three gifts in the past five years, who did the asking?**

Gift #1: Amount:	Title of Asker:
$70,000,000	President
$20,000,000	CDO
$15,000,000	President
$12,000,000	IUF Staff/Univ. Admin.
$12,000,000	President
$11,600,000	Donor
$10,000,000	President
$10,000,000	Pres./Vol./CDO
$10,000,000	President
$8,000,000	Plan. Giv. Off./Pres.
$7,800,000	President
$6,000,000	Former President
$6,000,000 (Beq.)	Pres./VP, Development
$5,000,000	Headmaster
$5,000,000	President/Board Chair

$5,000,000	Headmaster/CDO
$5,000,000	Headmaster/CDO
$5,000,000	Pres./Campaign Chair
$5,000,000	President
$4,600,000	Pres./Dev. Officer
$4,000,000	President
$4,000,000	President/CDO
$3,500,000	President/Headmaster
$2,500,000	Pres./Board of Trustees
$2,100,000	CDO
$2,000,000	President
$2,000,000	President (by letter)
$2,000,000	President
$2,000,000	President
$1,750,000	President
$1,718,838	President
$1,600,000	President
$1,500,000	VP, Agriculture
$1,500,000	Chancellor
$1,500,000	Spontaneous by DCC
$1,300,000	CDO
$1,250,000	President/Vice President
$1,000,000	Trustee Campaign Vol.
$1,000,000	President
$1,000,000	Pres./Dir. of Dev.
$1,000,000	President/Trustee
$1,000,000	President
$1,000,000	Pres./VP, Development
$1,000,000	President
$1,000,000	Chancellor
$1,000,000	President
$940,000	Trustee
$750,000	Regional Adv. Officer
$750,000	President
$500,000	President
$500,000	Headmaster/Chair, BOT
$355,000	Headmaster
$250,000	Headmaster
$150,000	Development Director
undefined	Headmaster
undefined	Trustee/Headmaster
undefined	President

Gift #2: **Amount:**	**Title of Asker:**
$50,000,000	Pres./Trustee/Dev. Off.
$12,000,000	Dean of Prof. School
$11,000,000	IUF Staff
$10,000,000	Pres./Dean/CDO
$10,000,000	Pres./Vol./CDO
$6,000,000	President
$6,000,000	President
$5,000,000	President

$5,000,000	President/Vice President
$5,000,000	Board President/CDO
$3,600,000	Trustee/Headmaster
$3,500,000	Pres/Campaign Chair
$3,500,000	Pres/Campaign Chair
$3,200,000	Head/DCC
$3,000,000	President
$3,000,000	President
$3,000,000	Trustee
$2,500,000	Trustee/Pres./VP, Dev.
$2,500,000	Headmaster
$2,200,000	President/CDO
$2,000,000	President
$2,000,000	Pres/Alumni Director
$2,000,000	VP, Foundation
$2,000,000	Chancellor/Dean
$2,000,000	Vol./Trustee/DO
$2,000,000	Golf Coach
$2,000,000	Former President
$1,800,000	Dir., Capital & Planned
$1,700,000	Unexpected bequest
$1,595,000	Grant roposal
$1,500,000	Development Officer
$1,000,000	Chancellor
$1,000,000	Unsolicited
$1,000,000	VP, Adv./Trustee
$1,000,000	Planned Giving Officer
$1,000,000	Campaign Chair
$930,000	President/Vice President
$910,000	Trustee/Headmaster
$900,000	VP, Development
$875,000	Major Gifts Officer
$750,000	Chair of Board
$520,000	President/Dean
$500,000	Headmaster
$500,000	President
$500,000	President
$500,000	VP, Development
$500,000	President
$400,000	Pres./VP, External Rel.
$375,000	Pres./Chair, Res. Comm.
$347,000	Headmaster/Others
$100,000	Trustee
$100,000	Bishop
$100,000	Headmaster
undefined	Headmaster
undefined	Trustee/Headmaster
undefined	President
Miscellaneous	CDO

Gift #3: Amount:	Title of Asker:
$25,000,000	Trustee Self-solicitation
$10,000,000	Volunteer
$9,000,000	Pres./Vol./CDO
$7,500,000	Chanc., Health Affairs
$5,000,000	President
$5,000,000	President
$5,000,000	Vice President
$4,500,000	Dean/President/Donor
$4,000,000	Trustee
$3,000,000	Staff Member
$2,800,000	Headmaster
$2,600,000	Chancellor
$2,500,000	Donor Self-initiated
$2,500,000	Pres/Campaign Chair
$2,500,000	President
$2,000,000	Trustee
$2,000,000	President/Volunteer
$2,000,000	President
$2,000,000	Development Officer
$2,000,000	Trustee
$1,500,000	VP, Development
$1,500,000	President
$1,200,000	Department Chair
$1,100,000	President/Volunteer
$1,000,000	President/CDO
$1,000,000	Planned Giving Officer
$1,000,000	Head/Dev. Comm. Chair
$1,000,000	Trustee/President
$1,000,000	Athletic Director
$1,000,000	Self-solicitation
$1,000,000	President
$1,000,000	Trustee Head
$1,000,000	Chair, CC/Board Chair
$914,094	VP, Development
$900,000	President/Vice President
$850,000	Trustee Emeritus
$820,000	President
$750,000	President
$600,000	Unsolicited
$500,000	VP, Development
$500,000	VP, Development
$500,000	Pres./Board Chair
$500,000	Headmaster/Dir. of Dev.
$400,000	Bequest
$350,000	President
$300,000	Major Gifts Officer
$300,000	President
$300,000	Director of Development
$250,000	Chair, Resources Comm.
$250,000	VP, Development
$100,000	Headmaster/Trustee

$85,000	Bequest, Trustee
$20,000	Rector/President
undefined	Trustee/Headmaster
undefined	Headmaster
undefined	Director of Development
Miscellaneous	CDO

28. a) **Since 1983, has your use of volunteers in major gifts solicitation increased or decreased?** (57 respondents)

Increased:	49
Decreased:	7
Stayed the same:	1

28. b) **Since 1983, what is your estimated percentage of increase or decrease in use of volunteers in major gifts solicitation?** (55 respondents)

5% increase:	0
10% increase:	8
25% increase:	12
50% increase:	15
100% increase:	13
5% decrease:	0
10% decrease:	0
25% decrease:	4
50% decrease:	2
100% decrease:	1

29. **Since 1983, approximately what percentage of major gifts were secured by volunteers?** (55 respondents)

10%:	19
25%:	15
50%:	9
Other, specify:	
75%:	3
Volunteer and staff team, 75%:	1
65%:	1
60%:	1
37%:	1
<5%:	1
0-10%:	2
0%:	2

30. **Since 1983, approximately what percentage of major gifts were secured by the president?** (55 respondents)

10%:	13
25%:	15
50%:	20
Other, specify:	
80%:	1
75%:	1
60%:	1
More than 50%:	1
<10%:	2
2%:	1

31. **Since 1983, approximately what percentage of major gifts were secured by the development staff?** (56 respondents)

10%:	8
25%:	19
50%:	14
Other, specify:	
90%:	1
88%:	1
80%:	1
75%:	3
65%:	3
40%:	2
20%:	1
15%:	1
<10%:	1
0%:	1

32. **Do you usually send more than one solicitor on a major gifts solicitation call?** (57 respondents)

Yes:	46
No:	11

33. **If yes, what is the most usual combination?** (48 respondents; one indicated two choices)

President/Trustee:	16
President/CDO:	16
President/Other Volunteer:	6
CDO/Trustee:	5
CDO/Other Volunteer:	5
Other:	
Development Staff with Volunteers/Faculty:	1

ENDOWMENT PROGRAM

34. Do you have a range of named endowments for endowed funds? (57 respondents)

Yes:	53
No:	4

35. If yes, what is your minimum for an endowed professorship? (54 respondents)

$2,000,000:	1
$1,600,000:	1
$1,500,000:	3
$1,250,000:	1
$1,000,000:	21
$700,000:	1
$600,000:	1
$500,000:	10
$300,000:	1
$250,000:	7
$200,000:	1
$100,000:	3
N/A:	3

36. If your minimum negotiable? (51 respondents)

Yes:	22
No:	29

37. If yes, please explain to what degree.

- "The limit hasn't been challenged."
- "Depending on relationship with donor and the likelihood of additional gifts from that individual. Reviewed by major gifts committee."
- "Depends on the donor and future gift potential."
- "Circumstances may dictate; no explicit constraints are put on the solicitor."
- "We use an accumulative option--the opening gift can vary."
- "We only moved the number up to $500,000 during our centennial campaign; before that, it was as low as $100,000."
- "We seek at least 50 percent of fully funded amount when it is established and plan to secure the remaining amount in short-term future."
- "The donor's depth of affiliation and specific giving timetable will always be considered, but we have policies that offer a strong framework from which we try not to stray far."
- "We plan to raise to $1,250,000 from $1,000,000 by the end of 1991."
- "Nothing is firmly established."
- "We are in the process of adding lower levels for various types of positions and needs."
- "Can be higher."
- "Present value--negotiate faster payment than five years; very infrequent."

- "Support for other ranks is possible as are combinations of outright gifts and life insurance or other expectancies."
- "At present the college has very few endowed professorships."
- "Planned gift or pledged gift--accept first payments and establish without full pledge."
- "Down to $300,000 to $400,000, although we are getting more stringent about this."
- "We have six endowed professorships that range in size from $100,000 to $600,000."
- "It is negotiable for gifts in areas where the market demand for faculty is not keen: $300,000 in an endowment for a professorship in sociology or geography has as much impact as a $500,000 professorship in civil engineering."

38. **Do you have multiple levels of faculty positions that can be endowed?** (56 respondents)

Yes:	37
No:	19

39. **If yes, please list them with the amount required for endowment:**

Position	Endowment Required
Assistant/Associate Professor	$250,000
Assistant Professorship	$100,000
Associate Professorship	$200,000
Assistant Lecturer	$250,000
Associate	$750,000
Associate Chair	$700,000
Capital Endowment on Existing Line	$750,000
Career Development Chair	$750,000
Chair for Senior Faculty	$750,000
Chair	$1,000,000
Chair	$1,500,000
Chair	$1,000,000-$1,500,000
Chair	$1,000,000
Chair	$1,000,000
Chair	$1,000,000
Chair	$1,000,000
Chair	$1,000,000
Chair	$1,000,000
Chair	$500,000
Chair	$500,000
Chair	$500,000
Department	$1,000,000
Distinguished Professor	$500,000
Distinguished Professor	$200,000
Distinguished Service Professorship	$750,000
Distinguished Teaching Professorship	$500,000
Distinguished Teaching Professorship	$250,000
Faculty Chair	$250,000-$500,000

Faculty Development Chair	$500,000
Faculty Fellowship	$50,000
Faculty Research Fund	$100,000
Faculty Scholar	$800,000
Fellowship	$500,000
Fellowship	$100,000
Full Chair	$1,400,000
Full Chair & Program Fund	$1,750,000
Full Endowment	$1,500,000
Headmaster	$1,000,000
Instructorship	$250,000
Instructorship	$500,000
Intern	$300,000
Junior Faculty Position	$750,000
Junior Faculty (Tenure Track)	$600,000
Lecturer	$500,000
Lectureship	$250,000
Master Teacher Chair	$50,000
Mastership	$250,000
Presidential Endowed Chair	$1,250,000
Professor	$500,000
Professor	$300,000
Professor	$1,250,000
Professor	$1,500,000
Professorial Chair	$1,000,000
Professorship	$300,000
Professorship	$100,000
Professorship	$500,000
Professorship	$2,000,000
Professorship	$100,000
Professorship	$500,000
Professorship	$250,000
Professorship	$250,000
Professorship	$250,000
Professorship	$1,600,000
Professorship	$1,000,000
Professorship	$400,000-$500,000
Professorship	$1,000,000
Professorship	$500,000
Research Chair	$1,500,000
Scholar in Residence	$100,000
Scholars	$350,000
Senior Master Chair	$50,000
Third Century Professor	$1,500,000
Visiting Lecture	$50,000
Visiting Lecturer	$500,000
Visiting Professor	$500,000
Visiting Professor	$500,000
Visiting Professor	$500,000
Visiting Professorship	$500,000
Other	$500,000

40. **What percentage of the endowment income for an endowed professorship is used for salaries?** (44 respondents)

100%:	18
90%:	2
85%-100%	1
85%:	2
83%:	1
80%:	3
77%:	2
75%:	3
71%:	3
60%:	1
50%:	2
Varies:	5
Not set yet:	1

41. **When do you fill your endowed professorships?** (51 respondents)

At time of pledge:	4
50% funded:	6
100% funded:	27
Other, specify:	
75%:	2
66%:	1
62%:	1
60%:	2
33%:	1
First payment:	1
Not determined:	2
Varies:	2
When the money starts coming in:	1
When money equals salary:	1

42. **Do you fill a chair now for a gift subject to life income?** (47 respondents)

Yes:	7
No:	40

43. **Do you fill a chair now for a documented bequest provision?** (48 respondents)

Yes:	2
No:	46

44. Do you market endowments for other than full professorships? (51 respondents)

Yes:	34
No:	17

45. If yes, please list for what positions and the endowment required:

Position	Endowment Required
Assistant Lecturer	$250,000
Associate	$750,000
Associate Professorship	$700,000
Awards	$50,000
Cap Endowment on Existing Line	$750,000
Chair	$1,000,000
Chair/Scientist/Librarian	$1,000,000
Chairs	$1,000,000
Dean of the Chapel	$750,000
Director of Libraries	$750,000
Dir., Soc. Science Res. Center	$750,000
Endowed Fund	$10,000
Faculty Fellowship	$50,000
Faculty Research Fund	$100,000
Faculty Salary Fund	$25,000
Faculty Scholar	$800,000
Faculty Scholars	$500,000
Fellowship--Asst. or Assoc. Prof.	$1,000,000
Fellowship for Junior Faculty	$500,000
Fellowship	$100,000
Fellowships	$50,000
Fellowships	$100,000
Fellowships	$50,000
Full Scholarship	$300,000
Full-tuition Scholarship	$35,000
Graduate Assistants/Interns	$50,000
Graduate Study	$100,000
Instructorships	$250,000
Junior Faculty	$600,000
Junior Faculty	$300,000
Junior Faculty Position	$750,000
Lecturer	$500,000
Lecture Series	$100,000
Lectureship	$25,000
Lectureship	$25,000
Lectureship	$25,000
Lectureship	$300,000
Lectureship	$100,000
Librarianship	$1,250,000
Named Librarian	$100,000
Naming Opportunity	$10,000
One-year Internship	$250,000

Partial Scholarship	$50,000
Professorship	$1,000,000
Program Funds	$50,000
Sabbatical Leave	$500,000
Scholarship	$150,000
Scholarship Assistance	$15,000
Scholarship Fund	$100,000
Scholarship/Loan	$10,000
Teaching Fund	$200,000
Teaching Sabbatical	undefined
Visiting Endowed Professor	$500,000
Visiting Fellows	$100,000
Visiting Fellowship	$150,000
Visiting Lectureship	$500,000
Visiting Lectureship	$100,000
Visiting Professor	$1,000,000
Visiting Professor	$500,000
Visiting Professor	$50,000
Visiting Professor	Varies

46. **Do you actively promote endowments for other purposes or programs?** (55 repondents)

Yes:	53
No:	2

47. **If yes, please list for what purpose or program and the size of the endowment required:**

Purpose or Program	Endowment Required
Academic Program Support	Negotiable
Academic Departmental Program	$250,000
Artist in Residence	$100,000
Athletics	Varies
Athletic Department Support	$10,000
Awards	$5,000
Book Fund	$10,000
Book Funds	$10,000
Book Funds	$10,000
Building	$1,000,000
Building maintenance	60% of building value
Capital Maintenance	Negotiable
Center	$2,000,000
Department Equipment Fund	$25,000
Departmental Funding	$10,000
Departmental Honors Prize	$10,000
Departmental Research Fund	$500,000
Endowed Equipment Funds/Labs	$50,000-$1,000,000
Endow a Student	$5,000-$200,000
Enhancement Funds for Department	$10,000
Equipment	$25,000

Faculty Development	$50,000
Faculty Development	$1,000,000
Faculty Incentives	$200,000
Faculty/Staff Development Fund	$50,000
Faculty Support Fund	$100,000
Faculty Support	Negotiable
Fellowships	$50,000
Financial Aid	$50,000
Financial Aid	$350,000
Financial Aid	$150,000
Financial Aid	$10,000
Financial Aid	$25,000
Financial Aid	$250,000
Graduate Fellowship	$100,000
Graduate Fellowships	$50,000
Guest Lecturer	$100,000
Honors Awards	$10,000
Horse & Campus Program	All we can get
Institute	$3,000,000
Internships	$25,000
Leadership Program	$200,000
Lecture	$50,000
Lecture Series	$25,000
Lectureships	$100,000
Lectureships	$20,000
Lectureships	$25,000
Lectureships	$25,000
Library	$5,000
Library	$1,000,000
Library	$25,000
Library Acquisitions/Conservation	$10,000
Library Book Fund	$10,000
Library Fund	$10,000
Maintenance	Depends on need
Maintenance Reserve	Open
New Student Center	$2,500,000
Presidential Discretionary Fund	$100,000
Presidential Scholarship	$25,000
President's Distinguished Scholar	$50,000
Prize and Book Funds	$10,000
Prize Funds	$5,000
Prizes	$10,000
Program	$1,000,000
Program Support	$10,000
Program Support	$25,000
Program Support	Depends on need
Programmatic	$10,000
Research	$100,000
Research/Training Programs	$50,000
Scholarships--boarding	$250,000
Scholarships--day	$150,000
Scholarship--full	$200,000
Scholarships--full	$350,000
Scholarships--full	$300,000

Scholarship--minimum	$20,000
Scholarship	$100,000
Scholarship	$10,000
Scholarship	$300,000
Scholarship	$50,000
Scholarship	$250,000
Scholarship	$150,000
Scholarship	$50,000
Scholarship	$10,000
Scholarship	$5,000 min.
Scholarship	$25,000
Scholarship	$25,000
Scholarship	$75,000
Scholarship	$10,000
Scholarship	$25,000
Scholarship	$17,000
Scholarship	$50,000
Scholarship	$10,000
Scholarship	$10,000
Scholarship	$25,000
Scholarship	$10,000
Scholarship	$15,000
Scholarship	$10,000
Scholarship	$30,000
Scholarship	$100,000
Scholarship	$5,000
Scholarship	$10,000
Scholarship	$25,000
Scholarship	$10,000
Scholarships	$10,000
Scholarship Fund	$300,000
Scholarship/Graduate Fellowship	$10,000
Student Financial Aid	$25,000
Student Loan Fund	$100,000
Student Services	$10,000
Undergraduate Scholarships	$25,000
Unrestricted Opportunity Funds	$50,000
Visiting Professorship	$100,000

NAMING OPPORTUNITIES

48. **Do you have capital or other naming opportunities?** (57 respondents)

Yes:	55
No:	2

49. Do you have a specific set of policies regarding naming opportunities? (57 respondents)

Yes:	34
No:	23

50. If you have a policy, to what extent is it negotiable?

- "It is always negotiable within certain guidelines."
- "Must be discussed with head, board, and development director."
- "Not usually negotiable."
- "Somewhat, based on discussion with head, trustees, and donor."
- "Seems to be very negotiable. Usually at least 50 percent of building value; $25,000 or more for named endowment."
- "Somewhat."
- "Has been very negotiable in the past; we are working to establish firm guidelines."
- "Variable."
- "Depends on size of gift and the donor."
- "Down to 50 percent of cost on buildings, etc."
- "Very negotiable."
- "Moderate."
- "At the discretion of the president and board of trustees."
- "It is somewhat negotiable on facilities. On endowment, policy is not negotiable with respect to amount required, but payment period is variable."
- "Only a little. We will take into account special circumstances regarding donor and/or financial requirements."
- "Negotiable when existing buildings are involved."
- "Negotiable based on the nature of gift (current cash, deferred); negotiable based on size of project (lower percentage may be acceptable on larger projects)."
- "Not negotiable."
- "Subject to review by the Board of Regents."
- "We are usually willing to work with the donor or family."
- "Not very."
- "Policies are guidelines, we'll consider the donor's circumstances and negotiate a reasonable solution."
- "Slightly."
- "Naming opportunities are completely negotiable between donor and university officials, except in the case of naming a new building where a $500,000 minimum is necessary."
- "Some flexibility, but must keep in context with other similar naming opportunities in existence."
- "To some degree."
- "Very flexible."
- "[We require] 51 percent of building; could be negotiable if project is small enough. Also we put prices on rooms."
- "Negotiable; no set gift value. Policy states honoree must be deceased five years; this is also negotiable."
- "Some degree, depending on donor."
- "It is negotiable."

51. If you have no specific policy in that regard, what is your practice?

- "Only one situation has arisen: it was approved by board action."
- "Depends on present situation. Planned gifts cannot be used for naming opportunities until realized. Bricks and mortar naming opportunities based on 75-100 percent cost of project."
- "Fifty-one percent of funding provided by donor who is naming."
- "Case by case evaluations with final decision by board."
- "We are in the midst of developing a policy."
- "Designated amounts attached to specific areas; plaques prepared per donor wishes: annual high class reception."
- "Amounts required are negotiable plus or minus 25 percent; payment periods are negotiable up to five years."
- "Estimate value of space to total cost of building."
- "Trustee Committee decides."
- "Flexible, depending on the area or size of gift."
- "Endowment must be of size to support 50 percent of the program needed."
- "To submit the request to the board of trustees for approval."
- "We have just begun and use a list of areas with amounts."
- "As new projects are funded, we decide at that time whether or not naming opportunities would be productive ."

52. What percentage of the total cost of a capital project must be covered to name a building? (47 repondents)

75%:	3
66%:	1
60%:	1
55%:	1
51%:	3
50%-100%:	1
50%:	23
40%:	1
33%:	2
25%:	4
25%-50%:	1
20%:	1
1%:	1
Varies:	1
Varies in the 100% range:	1
N/A:	1
No set percentage:	1

53. Do you include long-term maintenance costs in this projection? (51 respondents)

Yes:	16
No:	35

54. In practice, is your effort to raise such an endowment working? Please explain.

- "Too soon to tell."
- "No."
- "No, but it has not worked in two mini-campaigns; a very hard sell."
- "Yes, some success."
- "Not yet."
- "In the middle of a campaign; so far, so good."
- "Varied success."
- "Minimally."
- "Buildings are never 'sexy' so gifts are virtually always motivated by the academic ideal for the program to be housed, i.e., athletics or theater. Negotiations for maintenance endowment always continue behind the scenes."
- "Has failed in the past. With new program (entire development program changed in 1989) it is working. Endowment for maintenance is almost too high to be palatable, but it is well received by donors."
- "During a campaign period we have had good response."
- "College requires full project funding."
- "Yes, new library: $10,000,000 construction, $5,000,000 endowment."
- "Yes, most nameable units (physical) named. Making good progress on non-physical, such as scholarships, departmental endowments, and professorships."
- "The concerted effort to raise a large endowment has only been in effect for about two years. We are confident that the process we have in place in planned giving area will be successful in the long run."
- "Yes, gifts for capital projects are increasing; however, we do not raise funds for long-term maintenance."
- "We have made a few tries with middling success, usually for special projects like a fountain or the church."
- "Relatively successful--for new library, scientific equipment."
- "Works well with the exception of building projects."
- "No track record yet."
- "Yes. Endowment has increased 400 percent in 10 years--$3 million to $14 million."
- "It has been difficult to secure these funds."
- "We are considering stricter practices of raising endowment for operational purposes for the new buildings we intend to build."
- "Very slowly."
- "In our recent campaign we should have built in these funds."
- "Hard to fund building projects these days."
- "Haven't had to try yet."
- "The one time we did seek it, it worked. We put in place a $1,500,000 endowment for Alumni Center maintenance."
- "Too early to tell."
- "It is varied; we are new at it."
- "Some."

55. If yes, what is the percentage of the total project endowment? (12 respondents)

5%:	1
20%:	1
25%:	2
30%:	1
25-50%:	1
30-50%:	1
50%:	1
Varies:	3
Based on square footage:	1

56. Since 1983, have you found fund raising for capital projects to be: (54 respondents)

Easier:	11
More difficult:	17
About the same:	26

Chapter 2

Private Colleges

Twenty-four private colleges--actually, 23 colleges and one theological seminary--responded to the major gift questionnaire. Two of the colleges indicated that "four-year plus graduate programs and/or professional school" best described their programs; 21 checked "four-year college, baccalaureate emphasis"; one is a "graduate and professional school only." In this chapter, we use the word "colleges" to refer to all 24 respondents.

Ten of these 24 private college respondents are church-affiliated.

Nineteen of the colleges have enrollments of under 2,000 students; five have between 2,000 and 4,999 students.

Eleven of the colleges participated in the 1983 CASE survey of major gift policies and practices.

Major gifts defined

As donors and prospective donors become more involved in the ongoing life of their institutions, a common vocabulary among the professional staff becomes more important. The first set of survey questions sought to determine if fund-raising professionals at private colleges and universities are speaking the same language when they talk about major gifts to donors and prospects.

Eighteen of the 24 private colleges surveyed for this study use "major" to describe their larger gifts. Five colleges call them "leadership" gifts, and one college uses the word "special." The minimum gift required to qualify as a major gift was $25,000 at 10 of the 24 responding colleges. But seven colleges had a higher

minimum: Three colleges required $50,000, and four asked for $100,000. Seven colleges had minimums below $25,000 (one college at $20,000, three colleges at $10,000, two colleges at $5,000, and one college at $1,000).

Seventeen of 24 respondents indicated that their minimum requirement for major gifts has changed--mostly upward--since 1983. Four colleges had no definition of major gifts until a few years later, and one college considered $100 a major gift in 1983!

Of the major gifts received, the responding colleges reported receiving an average 60 percent in the form of cash; 23 percent in planned instruments; 15 percent in stocks; and approximately 2 percent in in-kind donations. Under "Other," three colleges reported receiving real estate (two at 1 percent and one at 5 percent). Real estate represented less than 1 percent of the major gift income for the private colleges as a group.

Where are the gifts coming from? Twenty-three of 24 colleges broke down their major gifts by donors--alumni, parents, nonalumni/friends, corporations, and foundations. Alumni were the biggest source of major gifts to these colleges with amounts that averaged 49 percent. At the 23 colleges, gifts from foundations and nonalumni/friends each averaged 20 percent. Corporations gave an average of 6 percent, and parents 5 percent. One college reported receiving almost 23 percent from government funding; this represented less than 1 percent of the gifts to the colleges as a group.

What proportion of the institutions' major gifts comes from board members? Twenty-four colleges responded with amounts that covered a broad range--one college received 4 percent and one received 80 percent from board members. The average for the responding colleges was 24 percent. Former board members gave an average of about 7 percent to these private colleges. Again, the range was wide: from 1 percent to 25 percent of the institutions' major gifts.

Twenty-three of the colleges broke down major gifts by percentages received in cash/convertible securities and in various forms of planned giving. These colleges responded that they received an average of 58 percent of all major gifts in the form of cash or convertible securities. Bequests accounted for an average 19

percent of major gifts at these colleges with one college reporting 92 percent from this source. The private colleges received an average of 3 percent from charitable remainder trusts and 3 percent from pooled income funds. Only three colleges reported receiving major gifts in the form of lead trusts (3 percent and under); this source was less than 1 percent of the overall total for the 23 colleges. The colleges reported an average of 17 percent from combinations (cash/convertible securities and deferred instruments) and less than 1 percent from "Other" (real estate, in-kind).

Major gift research

How important is prospect research to the major gift programs at these colleges? Thirteen colleges consider it very important; 10 responded that it is important; and only one called it somewhat important. No college considered it unimportant.

Many methods of prospect research are available, but respondents were asked to approximate the percentage of major gifts identified by four--referral, geodemographic screening, internal prospect research, and field screening. They could also write in other methods. All 24 colleges answered this question, but not every college uses all four methods.

Internal prospect research is the most important prospect research method to most of the respondents; the colleges identified an average 44 percent of their major gift prospects through this technique. Field screening was also important; the colleges used this method to identify the donors of 26 percent of their major gifts. The colleges first spotted donors of an average of 16 percent of their major gifts through referral and an average 9 percent through geodemographic screening. (Only nine colleges reported using geodemographic screening to identify major gift prospects; however, it has been especially useful for five of these: Two colleges identified 30 percent of their major donors this way, and one college each found 35, 40, and 50 percent.) The responding colleges identified 4 percent of their major gift prospects by other methods. One said it relied on "ongoing relationships" for 75 percent of its prospects.

The size of the prospect research staff significantly affects the research methods used by an institution. Five of the colleges surveyed have no prospect research staff. Fifteen have one to three prospect researchers; three colleges have four to six; and one has seven to nine. When asked if they felt they had adequate research help, 13 of the 24 colleges said no; these include the five with no researchers and eight of the 15 with one to three researchers. Seventeen of the respondents have a computerized system for tracking prospects.

When in a campaign, 17 of the respondents labeled their major gift efforts as very intense; five called them intense; and one, somewhat intense. There was a drop-off of intensity after the campaign ended. Three of the colleges said their major gift efforts were still very intense the first year out of a campaign; six said they were intense; and another seven described them as somewhat intense. Three said they were not intense.

More than a year after a campaign, three colleges said their major gift efforts remained very intense; five reported intense efforts; and eight reported somewhat intense efforts. Four said their major gift efforts were not intense at this stage.

The task of evaluating and rating major gift prospects can be handled by a variety of people. The colleges estimated the percentages of major gift prospects evaluated and rated by staff, staff and volunteers, and volunteers. Staff working with volunteers handle the greatest percentage--an average of 51 percent. Staff (working without volunteer assistant) is next with an average of 47 percent. As one of their methods of prospect research, six colleges use volunteers alone; overall, volunteers alone evaluated and rated only 2 percent of the private college major gift prospects. One respondent commented, "Program due to intensify and involve more volunteers as we move into a campaign."

Major gift staffing and solicitation

Of the 19 colleges that responded to the question regarding structuring of the major gift operation, 13 colleges use an Office of Major/Planned Gifts and six have separate offices for these two functions. At these colleges, according to one respondent, the two offices work "in close cooperation." Another commented,

"[The] planned giving director attends all major gift staff and prospect review meetings; [there is] full cooperation on all prospects and solicitation strategies." A third said that the offices work together "very directly--the director of planned giving also does major gift work of various types."

Fifteen of the respondent colleges have one or more major gift officers on staff. Of these colleges, 12 have one to three major gift officers, two have four to six, and one has seven to nine. Nine colleges have no major gift officers; eight of these indicated the person who staffs major gifts at their institutions. At two, the vice president for development is responsible for staffing major gifts, either alone (at one) or with the director of development (at the other). At one college each, the executive director of development, the director of institutional advancement, the associate vice president for development, or the acting director of development is responsible for major gifts. One college said, "One development director is responsible for all phases of fund raising."

At these 24 colleges, all the development officers handle 11 major gift donors and prospects or more. At six colleges, one development officer--in four cases, the vice president--handles 11 to 50; at five, one person manages 51 to 100; at 10 the number is 101 to 200; and at three colleges, it's over 200.

Thirteen of the 24 respondents are currently in a campaign, and of these, nine increased their major gift staff at the start of the campaign. Of the 13 colleges in campaigns, nine plan to retain the current level of major gift staffing at the completion of their campaign; two said they would reduce it; and two had not yet decided.

To what degree are those involved in an institution's fund-raising program responsible for securing major gifts? The survey asked respondents to use a one-to-five scale to rate the degree of major gift responsibility held by the president, chief development officer, dean, major gift officer, development officers, trustees, volunteers, and faculty members.

When a weighted average is used (5 being the most responsible), three major players--the chief development officer (4.9), major gift officer (4.7), and president (4.6)--were rated the individuals most responsible for securing major gifts.

Respondents ranked volunteers at 3.6 with trustees and development officers not far behind at 3.4 and 3.2 respectively. Deans (rated 1.8) and faculty (rated 1.7) bear little major gift responsibility at these colleges.

When asked who secured the top three gifts for the institution in the past five years, the colleges reported that the president alone secured 25 (52 percent) of the 48 largest gifts for an average amount of $1.92 million. The president teamed with someone else (usually a volunteer or the chief development officer) to secure another 20 (or 42 percent) of these gifts; the average was $1.78 million. With the president--alone or in a team--involved in 94 percent of the largest successful "asks," it is clear why the ability to raise money has become a major requisite for the college presidency.

Twenty of 24 respondents reported that their use of volunteers has increased since 1983; the increases averaged 50 percent. The three respondents that are using volunteers less now than in 1983 reported decreases of 25 percent (two institutions) and 50 percent (one institution).

In the period from 1983 to 1991, the development staff secured an average of 41 percent of all major gifts for the responding colleges. The president secured an average of 37 percent, while volunteers secured 16 percent. The answers given account for 95 percent of the major gifts at these colleges. The seeming reduction in the president's role compared to the statistics cited two paragraphs previously is due to the difference in the questions. When it comes to the *very largest* gifts over five years, the president is involved in almost all (94 percent) of the "asks." However, respondents indicate that he or she is involved in securing only approximately 37 percent of *all* major gifts during the past eight years.

At most of the responding colleges (18 of 24), more than one person goes on a major gift solicitation call. The most common combination is the president and the chief development officer (eight institutions), and the next most likely combination is the president and a trustee (seven institutions). Three colleges send the chief development officer, either with a trustee (two) or with another volunteer (one institution). One college reported sending the president with other volunteers. (There is one more combination than there are respondents because one college indicated two combinations as "most likely.")

Endowment program

When asked whether the institution has a range of named endowments, 21 of 24 colleges answered yes. Twelve of these have a $1 million minimum for an endowed professorship. Three have higher minimums: up to and including $1.5 million. Six report minimums below $1 million: One requires $700,000, three require $500,000, and two require $100,000. Of the seven colleges that consider their minimum to be negotiable, a common comment was that the college is currently in the process of establishing new and firm guidelines.

Thirteen colleges have multiple levels of faculty positions that can be endowed, and these ranged from a minimum of $50,000 for a visiting lecturer to a $1.75 million endowment required by one college for a "full chair and program fund endowment."

Six of the responding colleges use 100 percent of the endowment income for an endowed professorship for salaries. Ninety, 71, and 50 percent were reported by two colleges each; and 85, 77, and 60 percent were represented by one college each. Two colleges said that the percentage varies. (Most institutions have a policy of spending a set percent of endowment principal--say 5 or 6 percent--on the endowment's purpose; any remainder is retained in the principal to prevent its erosion by inflation. For example, an institution receiving a 7 percent yield and spending 5 percent would be using 71 percent of the endowment's income.)

When do the colleges fill an endowed professorship? Eleven of the 21 respondents to this question require that the endowed position be 100 percent funded. Three fill it at the time of the pledge (one qualified its answer with "usually"), and one waits until the first payment has been received. The remaining colleges require that a substantial percentage of the endowment be funded: Of these, two require 75 percent; two require 50 percent; and one college each requires 60 and 66 percent.

In the case of a gift subject to life income, only four of 19 colleges responding to this question would fill the chair at the time of the gift. Only two of 21 respondents would fill the chair at the time of a documented bequest.

Fourteen of 22 respondent colleges market endowments for positions other than full professorships. These range from one college that markets a visiting professorship for $50,000 to colleges that market positions (dean of the chapel, director of libraries, director of the Social Science Research Center--even junior faculty positions) at $750,000.

When asked if the colleges promote endowments for other purposes or programs, 22 colleges said yes. Scholarships or financial aid were mentioned 17 times with required endowments ranging from $5,000 to $100,000. Library and book funds were listed seven times with minimum endowments ranging from $5,000 to $1 million.

Naming opportunities

All 24 colleges have capital or other naming opportunities; half have specific policies regarding these opportunities. Some colleges said that negotiations consider the donor's relationship with the institution and the size of the gift, with the president and the trustees making the decision. One college said, "Negotiable based on the nature of gift (current cash, deferred); negotiable based on size of project (lower percentage may be acceptable on larger projects)." Another commented, "Policies are guidelines; we'll consider the donor's circumstances and negotiate a reasonable solution."

The colleges that do not have a policy said the decision to name depends on the size of the gift, trustee discretion, and the percentage of the gift to the total cost of the project. "Amounts required are negotiable plus or minus 25 percent; payment periods are negotiable up to five years," one college indicated. Evidently referring to naming opportunities for parts of buildings, another institution responded that it "estimate[s] value of space to total cost of building."

When asked what percentage of the total cost must be covered to name a building, 10 of 19 colleges answering this question said that 50 percent of the total cost must be covered. Two require 25 percent to be covered, and one college each responded with the following amounts: 66, 50-100, 40, 20, and 1 percent.

Only five of 22 colleges included long-term maintenance costs in the projection. When asked if this type of endowment raising program has worked, these five responded that it has. Among the positive comments were: "During a campaign period we have had good response" and "Relatively successful--for new library, scientific equipment." On the other hand, one said, "It has been difficult to secure these funds." Some colleges are just getting into this area. "We are considering stricter practices of raising endowment for operational purposes for the new buildings we intend to build" and "No track record yet, but we're going to start this practice with our new campaign" were among the comments by these colleges.

Of the colleges that actively promote these endowments, one reported that the percentage of the total project endowment alloted for maintenance is 30 percent; one reported that the percentage is "variable"; and one said that the endowment is based on dollars per square footage.

Is it harder to raise money for capital projects now than it was in 1983? Eleven of the private colleges thought so, while five found it about the same, and six said it was easier. Two of the private colleges did not respond to this question.

The alternative minimum tax (AMT), increased competition, and decreased federal support are among factors cited by those who think raising money for capital projects has gotten harder. "In recent years, AMT has reared its ugly head on a number of major gifts," said one college. Another college commented, "The challenges to be met have grown quickly and increased the sizes and numbers of major gifts required to meet them. Coincidentally, there is increased competition for the attention of the donor." A third said, "The erosion of federal financial aid has redirected former capital gifts from individuals [to financial aid]. Very few foundations give to bricks and mortar compared to five to 10 years ago."

However, some private colleges have cause for optimism. One said, "We completed a successful campaign in 1987. Our goal was $26 million and we raised $32 million. We are presently in a $50 million campaign, largely for endowment." Another said, "The college has gained greater recognition in recent years as a strong private liberal arts college. Consequently, more and larger gifts from foundations, businesses, and individuals have been received."

Private Colleges

MAJOR GIFTS DEFINED

1. **What word best describes your larger gifts?** (24 respondents)

Major:	18
Leadership:	5
Special:	1

2. **What is the minimum gift that qualifies for your lowest major gifts category?** (24 respondents)

$25,000:	10
$50,000:	3
$100,000:	4
Other:	
$1,000 -	1
$5,000 -	2
$10,000 -	3
$20,000 -	1

3. **Has your definition of major gifts levels changed since 1983?** (23 respondents)

Yes:	17
No:	6

4. **If yes, what was your previous definition?** (17 respondents)

- "$10,000 (now $25,000)": 4 institutions.
- "$25,000 (now $100,000)": 2 institutions.
- "Increased the amount of a planned gift from $15,000 to $50,000."
- "No such definition existed before 1986."
- "Above $10,000 (now $100,000)."
- "There wasn't one when I arrived in 1989."
- "$10,000 or more (now $50,000)": 2 institutions.
- "$1,000-$10,000 (now $10,000)."
- "$10,000 to $15,000 (now $25,000)."
- "Century Club $100 (now $1,000)."
- "Development office opened in April 1988. No classification prior to that time."
- "Program not clearly defined aside from endowed gifts."

5. **What percentage of your major gifts do you receive in each of the following forms?** (23 respondents)

Cash:	20% - 2
	35% - 1
	40% - 1
	50% - 2
	55% - 1
	56% - 1
	60% - 2
	64.52% - 1
	65% - 1
	68% - 1
	69% - 1
	70% - 3
	73% - 2
	75% - 1
	79% - 1
	80% - 1
	85% - 1
Stocks:	0% - 1
	3% - 1
	3.5% - 1
	5% - 1
	7% - 2
	10% - 6
	11% - 1
	15% - 1
	20% - 3
	22% - 1
	23.62% - 1
	25% - 2
	28% - 1
	40% - 1
In-kind:	0% - 12
	.2% - 1
	.5% - 1
	2.46% - 1
	3% - 2
	4% - 1
	5% - 3
	8% - 1
	10% - 1
Planned instruments:	0% - 1
	3% - 1
	5% - 2
	7% - 1
	9.41% - 1
	10% - 4
	16% - 1

	18% - 1
	20% - 1
	21% - 1
	23.8% - 1
	25% - 2
	30% - 1
	36% - 1
	50% - 1
	60% - 2
	70% - 1
Other: Real estate:	1% - 2
	5% - 1

6. **What percentage is received from:** (23 respondents)

Alumni:	0% - 1
	13% - 1
	16% - 1
	20% - 1
	22% - 1
	36% - 1
	39% - 1
	44% - 1
	48% - 1
	50% - 3
	55% - 2
	60% - 1
	62% - 3
	66% - 1
	69.1% - 1
	75% - 1
	80% - 1
	84% - 1
Parents:	0% - 5
	1% - 4
	1.5% - 1
	2% - 1
	3% - 2
	5% - 2
	6% - 1
	7% - 1
	10% - 3
	11% - 1
	14% - 1
	15% - 1
Nonalumni/friends:	1% - 1
	3% - 1
	5% - 1
	6% - 1
	9% - 1

	10% - 3
	10.9% - 1
	12% - 1
	13% - 1
	15% - 1
	16% - 1
	19% - 1
	20% - 3
	25% - 1
	30% - 2
	49% - 1
	54% - 1
	75% - 1
Corporations:	0% - 2
	.8% - 1
	1% - 2
	1.5% - 1
	3% - 4
	4% - 1
	4.8% - 1
	5% - 4
	8% - 1
	10% - 4
	11% - 1
	30% - 1
Foundations:	2% - 1
	3% - 1
	4% - 1
	5% - 2
	10% - 1
	11.3% - 1
	12% - 1
	13% - 1
	15% - 4
	19.2% - 1
	20% - 3
	25% - 1
	30% - 1
	35% - 1
	40% - 1
	51% - 1
	80% - 1
Other: Government:	22.9% - 1

7. **What percentage is received from:** (24 respondents)

Board members:	4% - 1
	5% - 2
	6% - 2
	10% - 5
	11% - 1
	15% - 3
	16% - 1
	18% - 1
	20% - 1
	23% - 1
	25% - 1
	27.4% - 1
	30% - 1
	35% - 1
	50% - 1
	80% - 1
Former board members:	0% - 5
	1% - 4
	1.4% - 1
	2% - 2
	5% - 3
	10% - 2
	15% - 1
	16% - 1
	16.3% - 1
	18% - 1
	20% - 1
	25% - 1

8. **Of the major gifts received, what percentage comes in the form of the following:** (23 respondents)

a) Pooled income fund:	0% or see "f" - 11
	2% - 3
	3% - 2
	4% - 2
	5% - 3
	9% - 1
	20% - 1
b) Lead trusts:	0% or see "f" - 19
	2% - 1
	3% - 3
c) Charitable remainder trusts:	0% or see "f" - 10
	1% - 1
	2% - 1
	3% - 4
	5% - 3
	9% - 2

	9.4% - 1
	17% - 1
d) Bequests:	0% or see "f" - 4
	1% - 1
	5% - 3
	10% - 2
	12% - 1
	15% - 1
	16% - 2
	19% - 1
	20% - 1
	25% - 1
	26% - 1
	30% - 2
	32% - 1
	59% - 1
	92% - 1
e) Cash or convertible securities:	0% or see "f" - 4
	28% - 1
	40% - 1
	56.2% - 1
	58.5% - 1
	61% - 1
	66% - 1
	70% - 4
	75% - 1
	76% - 1
	78% - 1
	80% - 2
	84% - 1
	90% - 2
	91% - 1
f) Combination:	0% or see "f" - 16
	2.4% - 1
	10% - 1
	20% - 1
	48% - 1
	100% - 3
g) Other: Real estate, in-kind:	0% - 21
	3% - 1
	5.5% - 1

9. **If the answer is "f," please indicate your estimated percentage received as:** (5 respondents)

a) Cash:	30% - 1 50% - 3 92% - 1
b) Planned Instruments:	70% - 1 50% - 3 8% - 1

Other comments:

- "Using life insurance as planned instrument mostly."

MAJOR GIFT RESEARCH

10. **How important do you consider prospect research to be in your major gifts?** (24 respondents)

Very important:	13
Important:	10
Somewhat important:	1
Not important:	0

11. **Approximately what percentage of your major gifts prospects was identified by each method?** (24 respondents)

Referral:	0% - 4 3% - 1 5% - 2 10% - 11 15% - 2 20% - 2 95% - 1 100% - 1
Geodemographic screening:	0% - 15 5% - 1 10% - 3 30% - 2 35% - 1 40% - 1 50% - 1
Internal prospect research:	0% - 2 5% - 3 10% - 1 20% - 3 25% - 1 30% - 2 40% - 2

		45% - 1
		70% - 1
		75% - 2
		80% - 1
		90% - 3
		95% - 1
		100% - 1
Field screening:		0% - 4
		2% - 1
		5% - 2
		10% - 6
		15% - 1
		20% - 1
		30% - 1
		35% - 1
		50% - 2
		60% - 2
		75% - 1
		80% - 2
Other:	Miscellaneous:	5% - 2
		20% - 1
	Ongoing relationships:	75% - 1

12. What is the size of your prospect research staff?
(24 respondents)

None:	5
1-3:	15
4-6:	3
7-9:	1
10 or more:	0

13. Do you feel that you have adequate research help?
(24 respondents)

Yes:	11
No:	13

14. Do you have a computerized system for tracking prospects?
(24 respondents)

Yes:	17
No:	7

15. **Please rate the intensity of your major gifts effort by circling the appropriate number:** (24 respondents)

In a campaign:	
Very intense:	17
Intense:	5
Somewhat intense:	1
Not intense:	0
Not ranked:	1
First year out of campaign:	
Very intense:	3
Intense:	6
Somewhat intense:	7
Not intense:	3
Not ranked:	5
More than one year out:	
Very intense:	3
Intense:	5
Somewhat intense:	8
Not intense:	4

16. **Approximately what percentage of your major gifts prospects are evaluated and rated by:** (24 respondents)

Volunteers:	0% - 18
	5% - 2
	10% - 4
Staff:	0% - 7
	5% - 1
	25% - 1
	30% - 2
	50% - 1
	60% - 1
	65% - 1
	75% - 1
	80% - 4
	90% - 3
	100% - 2
Staff with volunteers:	0% - 3
	5% - 1
	10% - 1
	15% - 1
	20% - 3
	25% - 1
	35% - 1
	40% - 2
	60% - 2
	75% - 1
	95% - 1
	100% - 7

Please include any comments.

- "This will be changing soon with establishment of a major gifts committee."
- "Program is due to intensify and involve more volunteers as we move into a campaign."

MAJOR GIFTS STAFFING AND SOLICITATION

17. **Is your major gifts operation structured as:** (19 respondents)

a) Office of Major Gifts:	0
b) Office of Major/Planned Gifts:	13
c) Separate offices for each category:	6

18. **If separate offices, describe briefly how planned giving interfaces with other major gift work?**

- "We have a director of planned giving and one associate vice president for development who handle major gifts."
- "Each regional advancement officer (six) is responsible for major gifts cultivation and solicitation within his or her region."
- "Director of planned giving is considered a key member of the major gifts team (director of major gifts plus five major gifts officers); director of planned giving reports to director of development. Director of planned giving gets prospects by referral from major gifts officers; serves as in-house consultant."
- "Work in close cooperation."
- "[The offices work together] very directly--the director of planned giving also does major gifts work of various types."
- "One director of major gifts and one assistant director of major gifts; one director of planned giving and one half-time planned giving staff member. Both areas have been expanded in the last year."
- "All major gifts flow through alumni and development; we're not large enough for a separate division."
- "Planned giving director attends all major gifts staff and prospect review meetings; full coordination on all prospects and solicitation strategies."
- "No separate officer of major/planned gifts exists. All senior officers are constantly aware of gift aspect that can optimize the act of a major donor."

19. **Do you have one or more major gifts officers currently working in your office?** (24 respondents)

Yes:	15
No:	9

20. If yes, how many? (15 respondents)

1-3:	12
4-6:	2
7-9:	1
10 or more:	0

21. If no, who is responsible for staffing major gifts?

- "Vice president for development": 3 institutions.
- "Associate vice president for development."
- "Director of development is responsible for all phases of fund raising."
- "Executive director of development."
- "Director, institutional advancement."
- "Acting director of development."
- "One development director for all aspects of fund raising."
- "Director of development and vice president for advancement."
- "Major gifts are fully supported in the development office for all officers with staff assignment varying as to the circumstances and prospects."

22. How many major gifts donors and prospects are managed by one development officer? (24 respondents)

10 or fewer:	0
11-50:	6
51-100:	5
101-200:	10
over 200:	3

23. Are you currently in a campaign? (24 respondents)

Yes:	13
No:	11

24. If yes, did you hire or increase your major gifts staff at the start of the campaign? (13 respondents)

Yes:	9
No:	4

25. Will you retain your current level of major gifts staffing at the completion of your campaign? (13 respondents)

Yes:	9
No, will reduce it:	2
No, will eliminate it:	0
Don't know yet:	2

26. To what degree is each person responsible for securing a major gift? (23 respondents)

President: (weighted average 4.6)	
1:	0
2:	1
3:	1
4:	5
5:	16
Chief development officer: (4.9)	
1:	0
2:	0
3:	0
4:	2
5:	21
Dean: (1.8)	
1:	9
2:	8
3:	4
4:	0
5:	1
Not ranked:	1
Major gifts officer: (4.7)	
1:	1
2:	1
3:	1
4:	2
5:	13
Not ranked:	5
Development officers: (3.2)	
1:	0
2:	2
3:	9
4:	8
5:	2
Not ranked:	2
Trustees: (3.4)	
1:	0
2:	3
3:	6
4:	9
5:	5
Not ranked:	0

Volunteers (alumni or other): (3.6)

1:	0
2:	3
3:	8
4:	10
5:	2
Not ranked:	0

Faculty member: (1.7)

1:	8
2:	12
3:	2
4:	0
5:	0
Not ranked:	1

27. **Of your institution's top three gifts in the past five years, who did the asking?**

Gift #1: Amount:	Title of Asker:
$10,000,000	President
$6,000,000	Pres./VP, Dev. (beq.)
$6,000,000	Former President
$5,000,000	President/Board Chair
$5,000,000	President
$4,600,000	Pres./Dev. Officer
$4,000,000	President/CDO
$2,000,000	President
$2,000,000	President, by letter
$2,000,000	President
$1,750,000	President
$1,718,838	President
$1,600,000	President
$1,250,000	President/Vice Pres
$1,000,000	President
$1,000,000	President
$1,000,000	Pres./VP, Dev.
$1,000,000	President
$1,000,000	President/Trustee
$1,000,000	Pres./Dir. of Dev.
$750,000	President
$750,000	Regional Adv. Officer
$500,000	President
$150,000	Development Director

Gift #2: Amount:	Title of Asker:
$5,000,000	President
$3,000,000	President
$3,000,000	President

$2,200,000	President/CDO
$2,000,000	Former President
$2,000,000	President/Alumni Dir.
$1,800,000	Dir., Cap./Plann. Giv.
$1,595,000	Grant Proposal
$1,500,000	Development Officer
$1,000,000	VP Adv./Trustee
$1,000,000	Planned Gifts Officer
$1,000,000	No one
$930,000	President/VP
$900,000	VP, Development
$875,000	Major Gifts Officer
$750,000	Chairman of the Board
$520,000	Dean/President
$500,000	President
$500,000	VP, Development
$500,000	President
$500,000	President
$400,000	Pres./VP, Ext. Rel.
$375,000	Pres./Chair, Res. Comm.
$100,000	Bishop

Gift #3:

Amount:	Title of Asker:
$5,000,000	Vice President
$2,500,000	President
$2,500,000	Donor (self-initiated)
$2,000,000	Development Officer
$1,500,000	President
$1,500,000	VP, Development
$1,100,000	President/Volunteer
$1,000,000	President/CDO
$1,000,000	Pres., (Visit/Proposal)
$1,000,000	Self-solicited
$914,094	VP, Development
$900,000	President/VP
$820,000	President
$750,000	President
$600,000	No one
$500,000	VP, Development
$500,000	VP, Development
$500,000	Pres./Trustee Chair
$400,000	Bequest
$350,000	President
$300,000	President
$250,000	VP, Development
$250,000	Chair, Res. Comm.
$20,000	Rector/President

28. a) **Since 1983, has your use of volunteers in major gifts solicitation increased or decreased?** (24 respondents)

Increased:	20
Decreased:	3
Other: Stayed the same:	1

28. b) **Since 1983, what is your estimated percentage of increase or decrease in use of volunteers in major gifts solicitation?** (23 repondents)

5% increase:	0
10% increase:	3
25% increase:	7
50% increase:	4
100% increase:	6
5% decrease:	0
10% decrease:	0
25% decrease:	2
50% decrease:	1
100% decrease:	0

29. **Since 1983, approximately what percentage of major gifts were secured by volunteers?** (23 respondents)

10%:	12
25%:	8
50%:	1
Other, specify:	
0-10%:	2

30. **Since 1983, approximately what percentage of major gifts were secured by the president?** (24 respondents)

10%:	3
25%:	5
50%:	12
Other, specify:	
Less than 10%:	1
2%:	1
More than 50%:	1
75%:	1

31. **Since 1983, approximately what percentage of major gifts were secured by the development staff?** (23 respondents)

10%:	4
25%:	7
50%:	6

Other, specify:	
40%:	1
65%:	1
75%:	2
80%:	1
88%:	1

32. Do you usually send more than one solicitor on a major gifts solicitation call? (24 respondents)

Yes:	18
No:	6

33. If yes, what is the most usual combination?
(18 respondents; one indicated two choices)

President/Trustee:	7
President/Chief Development Officer:	8
President/Other Volunteer:	1
Chief Development Officer/Trustee:	2
Chief Development Officer/Volunteer:	1

ENDOWMENT PROGRAM

34. Do you have a range of named endowments for endowed funds?
(24 respondents)

Yes:	21
No:	3

35. If yes, what is your minimum for an endowed professorship?
(21 respondents)

$1,500,000:	2
$1,250,000:	1
$1,000,000:	12
$700,000 (Associate):	1
$500,000:	3
$100,000:	2

36. If your minimum negotiable? (20 respondents)

Yes:	7
No:	13

37. **If yes, please explain to what degree.**

- "At present, the college has very few fully endowed professorships."
- "Support for other ranks is possible as are combinations of outright gifts and life insurance or other expectancies."
- "Amount is not negotiable; but pledge payment period is negotiable up to five years."
- "Planned gift or pledged gift--accept first payments and establish without full pledge."
- "We use an accumulative option; the opening gift can vary somewhat."
- "We plan to raise to $1,250,000 from $1,000,000 by end of 1991."
- "We are in the process of adding lower levels for various types of positions and needs."
- "Nothing is firmly established."

38. **Do you have multiple levels of faculty positions that can be endowed?** (24 respondents)

Yes:	13
No:	11

39. **If yes, please list them with the amount required for endowment**

Position	Endowment Required
Associate Chair	$700,000
Associate	$750,000
Assistant Lecturer	$250,000
Chair	Negotiable
Chair	$500,000
Chairs for Senior Faculty	$750,000
Departmental	$1,000,000
Distinguished Teaching Professor	$500,000
Faculty Development Chairs	$500,000
Faculty Research Fund	$100,000
Full Chair	$1,400,000
Full Chair & Program Fund	$1,750,000
Junior Faculty Position	$750,000
Junior Faculty (Tenure Track)	$600,000
Lecturer	$500,000
Lectureship	Negotiable
Professorship	$100,000
Professorship	$300,000
Professorship	$1,000,000
Professorship	$1,500,000
Professorship	$1,250,000
Third Century Professorship	$1,500,000
Visiting Fellowship	Negotiable
Visiting Lecturer	$50,000
Visiting Lecturer	$500,000
Visiting Professor	$500,000
Visiting Professorship	$500,000

40. **What percentage of the endowment income for an endowed professorship is used for salaries?** (17 respondents)

100%:	6
90%:	2
85%:	1
77%:	1
71%:	2
60%:	1
50%:	2
Varies:	2

41. **When do you fill your endowed professorships?** (21 respondents)

At time of pledge:	2
50%:	2
100% funded:	11
Other (specify):	
60% cash in hand, written pledge bal.:	1
66% cash in hand:	1
75% funded:	2
First payment, whatever level:	1
Usually at time of pledge:	1

42. **Do you fill a chair now for a gift subject to life income?** (19 respondents)

Yes:	4
No:	15

43. **Do you fill a chair now for a documented bequest provision?** (21 respondents)

Yes:	2
No:	19

44. **Do you market endowments for other than full professorships?** (22 respondents)

Yes:	14
No:	8

45. **If yes, please list for what positions and the endowment required:**

Position	Endowment Required
Associate Professorship	$700,000
Dean of the Chapel	$750,000
Director of Libraries	$750,000
Dir., Soc. Science Res. Center	$750,000
Faculty Research Fund	$100,000
Faculty Salary Fund	$25,000
Junior Faculty Position	$750,000
Lectureship	$25,000
Lectureship	$100,000
Scholarship Assistance	$15,000
Visiting Fellowship	$150,000
Visiting Lectureship	$500,000
Visiting Lectureship	$100,000
Visiting Professor	$500,000
Visiting Professor	$500,000
Visiting Professor	$500,000
Visiting Professor	$1,000,000
Visiting Professor	$50,000

46. **Do you actively promote endowments for other purposes or programs?** (23 respondents)

Yes:	22
No:	1

47. **If yes, please list for what purpose or program and the size of the endowment required:**

Purpose or Program	Endowment Required
Academic Departmental Program	$250,000 min.
Athletics	Varies
Athletics Departmental Support	$10,000
Book Funds	$10,000
Book Funds	$10,000
Book Funds	$10,000
Building	$1,000,000
Capital Maintenance	Negotiable
Department Equipment Fund	$25,000
Departmental Funding	$10,000
Departmental Honors Prize	$10,000
Endow a Student	$5,000 min.
Enrichment/Pres./Res. Funds	$5,000 each
Equipment	$25,000 min.
Faculty/Staff Development Fund	$50,000
Faculty Support Fund	$100,000
Financial Aid	$350,000

Financial Aid	$150,000
Financial Aid	$25,000
Financial Aid	$10,000
General or Other Unrestricted	$5,000
Guest Lecture	$100,000
Honors Awards	$10,000
Internships	$25,000
Leadership Program	$200,000
Lecture	$50,000
Lecture Series	$25,000 min.
Lectureship	$20,000
Lectureship	$25,000
Library	$1,000,000
Library	$25,000 min.
Library	$5,000
Library Fund	$10,000
Presidential Discretionary Fund	$100,000
Prize Fund	$5,000
Prizes	$10,000
Research	$100,000
Scholarship	$75,000
Scholarship	$5,000
Scholarship	$10,000
Scholarship	$10,000
Scholarship	$50,000
Scholarship	$50,000
Scholarship	$100,000
Scholarship	$25,000
Scholarship	$25,000
Scholarship	$10,000
Scholarship	$10,000
Scholarship	$10,000
Student Loan Fund	$100,000
Student Services	$10,000

NAMING OPPORTUNITIES

48. **Do you have capital or other naming opportunities?** (24 respondents)

Yes:	24
No:	0

49. **Do you have a specific set of policies regarding naming opportunities?** (24 respondents)

Yes:	12
No:	12

50. **If you have a policy, to what extent is it negotiable?**

- "Down to 50 percent of cost of buildings, etc."
- "Variable."
- "It is somewhat negotiable depending on the size of the gift and the donor."
- "At the discretion of the president and board of trustees."
- "Negotiable based on the nature of gift (current cash, deferred); negotiable based on size of project (lower percentage may be acceptable on larger projects)."
- "Very negotiable."
- "Somewhat."
- "We are usually willing to work with the donor or family."
- "Policies are guidelines; we'll consider the donor's circumstances and negotiate a reasonable solution."

51. **If you have no specific policy in that regard, what is your practice?**

- "Trustee committee decides."
- "Amounts required are negotiable plus or minus 25 percent; payment periods are negotiable up to five years."
- "Designated amounts attached to specific areas; plaques prepared per donor wishes; annual high class reception."
- "We have just begun and use a list of area with amounts attached."
- "Ad hoc decisions depending on donor and project."
- "We are creating one as we go through our capital campaign."
- "Evaluate each building or capital project for appropriate naming opportunities."
- "Flexible, depending on the area or size of gift."
- "Estimate value of space to total cost of building."

52. **What percentage of the total cost of a capital project must be covered to name a building?** (19 respondents)

1%:	1
20%:	1
25%:	2
40%:	1
50%:	10
50-100%:	1
66%:	1
Varies in 100% range:	1
No set percentage:	1

53. **Do you include long-term maintenance costs in this projection?** (22 respondents)

Yes:	5
No:	17

54. **In practice, is your effort to raise such an endowment working? Please explain.**

- "Yes, new library: $10,000,000 construction; $5,000,000 endowment."
- "College requires full project funding."
- "During a campaign period we have had good response."
- "The concerted effort to raise a large endowment has only been in effect for about two years. We are confident that the process we have in place in planned giving area will be successful in the long run."
- "Relatively successful--for new library, scientific equipment."
- "It has been difficult to secure these funds."
- "Very slowly."
- "No track record yet, but we're going to start this practice with our new campaign."
- "In our recent campaign we should have built in these endowments."
- "Hard to find building projects these days."
- "We are considering stricter practices of raising endowment for operational purposes for the new buildings we intend to build."
- "Yes. Endowment has increased 400 percent in 10 years--$3,000,000 to $14,000,000."

55. **If yes, what is the percentage of the total project endowment?** (3 respondents)

Variable:	1
30%:	1
Based on dollars per sq. ft.:	1

56. **Since 1983, have you found fund raising for capital projects to be:** (22 respondents)

Easier:	6
More difficult:	11
About the same:	5

Please explain.

- "In recent years, AMT has reared its ugly head on a number of major gifts."
- "The challenges to be met have grown quickly and increased the sizes and numbers of major gifts required to meet them. Coincidentally, there is increased competition for the attention of the donor."
- "Donors are moving away from unrestricted giving. Prefer a project with which to identify."
- "The college has gained greater recognition in recent years as a strong private liberal arts college. Consequently, more and larger gifts from foundations, businesses, and individuals have been received."
- "Some of our traditional supporters for capital projects have changed their support to program areas."
- "Corporations/foundations are major sources and their support becomes

more fragmented; alumni have a greater interest in endowment programs."
- "Money is tighter."
- "The erosion of federal financial aid has redirected former capital gifts from individuals. Very few foundations give to bricks and mortar compared to five to 10 years ago."
- "We completed a successful campaign in 1987. Our goal was $26,000,000, and we raised $32,000,000. We are presently in a $50,000,000 campaign, largely for endowment."
- "We're in major campaign (1988-present)."
- "The 1980s were easier--the 1990s have been tougher."
- "Economy has caused many to be cautious and to take longer to make decisions."

INSTITUTIONAL INFORMATION

57. For what type of institution do you work?

Private/Independent:	24

58. Is your institution church-affiliated?

Yes:	10
No:	14

59. Is your institution:

A four-year college, baccalaureate emphasis:	21
Four-year plus grad. prog. and/or prof. sch.:	2
A graduate and professional school only:	1

60. What is the undergraduate student enrollment at your institution?

Under 2,000:	19
2,000 - 4,999:	5
5,000 - 9,999:	0
10,000 - 14,999:	0
15,000 - 19,999:	0

RESPONDENT INSTITUTIONS

Allegheny College
Assumption College
Augustana College
Carleton College
Colby-Sawyer College
Colorado College
Davis and Elkins College
Goucher College
Hope College
Louisiana College
Macalester College
Middlebury College
Mills College
Occidental College
Rockford College
Salem College
Simmons College
Smith College
St. Mary/Borromeo Seminaries
Thomas More College
Washington & Jefferson College
Wellesley College
Whitman College
Williams College

Chapter 3

Private Universities

This study includes six private universities, two of which are church-affiliated. Four describe themselves as research universities, and two said that "four-year plus graduate programs and/or professional school" best described their institutions.

One university has an enrollment of under 2,000; two have 5,000-9,999 students; two, 10,000-14,999; and one, 15,000-19,999.

All six were included in CASE's 1983 survey of major gifts, but in that report one was classified as a private men's college rather than a university.

Major gifts defined

As donors and prospective donors become more involved in the ongoing life of their institutions, a common vocabulary among the professional staff becomes more important. The first set of survey questions sought to determine if fund-raising professionals at private colleges and universities are speaking the same language when they talk about major gifts to donors and prospects.

Two of the institutions surveyed use "major" to describe their larger gifts, and two use "leadership" for this category. Two institutions by their comments on nomenclature indicate that their major gifts programs are especially sophisticated. One university uses "principal" for the top category of $5 million and above, "leadership" for $1 million to $5 million, and "major" for $100,000 to $1 million. Another uses "principal" for $1 million and above, "major" for $250,000 to $1 million, and "leadership" for $50,000 to $250,000.

The six respondent unversities also vary widely in the minimum gifts that qualify for their lowest major gift category. Two use $100,000; and one each uses $50,000, $25,000, $10,000, and $1,000.

Four of the six universities have changed their definition of major gift levels since 1983. Some of the change has been upward ($100,000 now compared to $50,000 in 1983), but some has also been a further refinement of definitions. "Major gifts were [anything between] $25,000 to $5 million," said one university. "Now it's $100,000 to $1 million with a new category of leadership gifts now $1 million-$5 million. Principal gifts remain $5 million and above."

Of the major gifts received by the private universities, 58 percent comes in the form of cash, 22 percent in stocks, 18 percent in planned instruments, and 2 percent in in-kind contributions. (The range of major gifts through planned instruments is wide--from 5 percent at one institution to 53 percent at another.)

Where are the gifts coming from? The universities were asked to indicate the percentage received from alumni, parents, nonalumni/friends, corporations, foundation, and other sources. Some skewing of the results toward individuals (alumni, parents, and nonalumni/friends) results from the fact that one major university in the group does not count gifts from corporations and foundations as "major gifts." (At this university, corporate and foundation donors are identified, cultivated, and solicited by an office--or offices--other than major gifts.)

Overall, these universities reported that they receive 38 percent of their gifts from alumni, 23 percent from foundations, 19 percent from nonalumni/friends, 17 percent from corporations, 2 percent from parents, and 1 percent from other sources.

Four universities responded to a question about major gifts received from current board members and three institutions reported gifts from former board members. Overall, the private universities received 6 percent of their major gifts from board members and another 4 percent from former board members.

The six respondent universities broke down their major gifts by percentages received in cash/convertible securities and in various forms of planned giving. They receive 44 percent of major gifts in cash/convertible securities, 20 percent from bequests, 16 percent from charitable remainder trusts, 1 percent from pooled income funds, and less than 1 percent from lead trusts. Combinations of cash/convertible securities and various planned giving instruments accounted for 19 percent of the gifts to these universities although most of this was accounted for by one university that reported receiving 100 percent of its gifts from combinations.

Major gift research

How important is prospect research to the major gift programs at these institutions? Four indicated that it was very important, and two said it was important. None said it was somewhat important or not important.

Many methods of prospect research are available, but respondents were asked to approximate the percentage of major gifts identified by four--referral, geodemographic screening, internal prospect research, and field screening. They could also write in other methods. Only one university uses geodemographic screening, but all six universities use the other three methods.

In contrast to other institutional groups in this survey, field screening (not internal prospect research) yielded the most major gift prospects. Universities identified 51 percent of their prospects through field screening, 26 percent through internal prospect research, 16 percent through referral, and 1 percent through geodemographic screening. One university indicated that it relied on a "long-time accumulation" to identify 40 percent of its major gift prospects. This accounted for 6 percent of the universities' overall total.

The size of the prospect research staff significantly affects the research methods used by an institution. Somewhat surprisingly, five of the universities have only one to three researchers; only one has seven to nine. Three universities say they have adequate prospect research help; the other three say they don't.

Five of the unversities have a computerized system for tracking prospects. The one that doesn't is now developing a system.

When in a campaign, five of the six universities term their major gift effort very intense and one calls it intense. In the first year out of a campaign, two continue to term their effort very intense; two, intense; and one each somewhat intense and not intense. More than one year out of a campaign, only one university calls its effort very intense; four rate it intense; and one, somewhat intense.

The task of evaluating and rating major gift prospects can be handled by a variety of people. The universities estimated the percentages of major gift prospects evaluated and rated by staff, staff and volunteers, and volunteers. Staff (working without volunteer help) evaluated and rated 46 percent of the respondents' major gift prospects while staff with volunteers evaluated and rated 42 percent. "Senior staff establish close relationships with volunteers and thus bring back useful donor/prospect information," said one university. Volunteers alone--probably in field screening situations favored by these universities--were responsible for evaluating and rating 12 percent, the largest percentage of any of the institutional groups.

Major gift staffing and solicitation

Four of the six universities have separate offices of major gifts and of planned gifts. "Directors of development in the schools are the major gift staff. A director of planned giving supports them," said one university. Three other universities indicate that planned giving officers serve as a resource and "handle referrals from major gifts field officers as well as receive direct inquiries."

Two universities have an Office of Major Gifts rather than separate offices or a combined Office of Major/Planned Gifts.

All six of the private universities have specialized major gift officers. Four indicate that they have four to six such officers; two universities have 10 or more major gift officers.

At four of the six universities, one development officer handles 51 to 100 donors and prospects; at one, he or she handles 101 to 200; and at one, development officers handle over 200 prospects.

Five of the six universities are now in a campaign, and all five hired more major gift staff members at the start of the campaign. Three plan to retain their current level of major gift staffing at the end of the campaign; one plans to reduce its major gift staff; and one hasn't decided.

To what degree are those involved in an institution's fund-raising program responsible for securing major gifts? The survey asked respondents to use a one-to-five scale to rate the degree of major gift responsibility held by the president, chief development officer, dean, major gift officer, development officer, trustees, volunteers, and faculty members.

Using a weighted average (5 being the most responsible), respondents ranked the chief development officer (4.7) the highest, followed closely by the president (4.3) and major gift officer (4.2). Trustees came fourth with 3.8. Private universities rely heavily on deans in their major gift effort; deans received a weighted average of 3.5, which was higher than the rating given them in any other institutional group in the survey. Private universities rated development officers and volunteers at 3.2 and faculty members lowest at 2.3.

When asked who secured the top three gifts for the university in the past five years, the respondents said that the president alone made the "ask" for eight (44 percent) of the 18 top gifts; the gifts secured by the president alone averaged $15.2 million. In addition, the president with a team member (trustee, development officer, planned giving officer, vice president) secured another five (28 percent) of the 18 gifts; these five gifts averaged $13.3 million.

All six private universities indicated that they had increased their use of volunteers since 1983. The average rate of increase was 43 percent.

In the period from 1983 to 1991, the development staff secured approximately 39 percent of the major gifts at the respondent universities; the president secured 38 percent; and volunteers, 21 percent. This accounts for 99 percent of the major gifts at these institutions. While these universities' presidents (alone or on a team) secured approximately 72 percent of the *very largest* gifts, they were somewhat less involved in securing all major gifts.

Five of the six respondent universities usually send more than one solicitor on a major gift solicitation call. The teams' composition varies greatly. One institution each says its most usual combination is the president and trustee, president and chief development officer, chief development officer and trustee, chief development officer and volunteer, and development staff with volunteers/faculty.

Endowment program

All six universities have a range of named endowment funds.

The highest required minimum endowment for a full professor was $2 million required by one university and the lowest was $500,000, also required by one university. Three require $l million although one of these is changing to $1.5 million in 1992. One requires $1.6 million.

Two universities' minimum is negotiable; four universities' minimum is nonnegotiable. Of those who indicate that it is negotiable, one says, "[The minimum] can be higher," and another says negotiation is "very infrequent."

Five of the six universities have multiple levels of faculty positions that can be endowed; one does not. The positions and levels mentioned include a professorship at $2 million, a research chair at $1.5 million, a faculty scholar at $800,000, a career development chair at $750,000, and a visiting professor at $500,000.

Of the endowment income for an endowed professor, what percentage is used for salaries? Three of the six universities use 100 percent; one uses 85 percent; and two 80 percent. (Most institutions have a policy of spending a set percentage of endowment principal--say 5 or 6 percent--on the endowment's purpose; any remainder is retained in the principal to prevent its erosion by inflation. For example, if an institution were receiving a 7 percent yield and spending 5 percent it would be using 71 percent of the endowment's income.)

When do the universities fill an endowed professorship? Two fill the professorship when the endowment is 50 percent funded and one when it is 100 percent funded. Other answers, cited by one university each, included "33 percent funded and binding pledge," 60 percent funded, and "when 100 percent pledged."

Only one of the six universities will fill a chair now for a gift subject to life income, and none will fill a chair now for a documented bequest provision.

Four of the universities market endowments for other than full professorships. Some of the examples cited were faculty scholar, lectureships, and visiting professorships.

All six universities promote endowments for other purposes or programs. These range from $10,000 for library acquisitions at one institution and $10,000 for "various purposes" at another to $2 million for a center and $3 million for an institute at one university each.

Naming opportunities

Six respondents have capital or other naming opportunities, and all six have specific sets of policies regarding these naming opportunities. One says their policies are not negotiable. The other five indicate some degree of flexibility. "Negotiable when existing buildings are involved," was one comment. Another university said that the policy was negotiable "only a little. We will take into account special circumstances regarding donor and/or financial requirements." A third said, "It is somewhat negotiable on facilities. On endowment, policy is not negotiable with respect to amount required, but payment period is variable."

Four of the six private universities require 50 percent of the total cost of a capital project to name a building. One university requires 55 percent and one requires 60 percent.

Half of the universities--three of six--include long-term maintenance costs in their projections. Two indicate that 25 percent of the total project endowment is set aside for long-term maintenance. The other university that includes maintenance in its projects did not specify what percentage.

None of the six respondent universities found fund raising for capital projects to be easier than in 1983. Three found it more difficult and three about the same. "[It is] easier to get commitments but more difficult to raise all the money due to big increases in costs of facilities," said one university. Another echoed, "Higher building costs are a factor. Now it usually requires more than one donor to complete a project." One respondent indicates that donors take a while to adapt to changing institutional needs: "Probably capital projects have been more difficult because in 1983-88 the emphasis was totally on endowment. It's only in the last two years that we have begun to emphasize both."

Private Universities

MAJOR GIFTS DEFINED

1. **What word best describes your larger gifts?** (6 respondents)

Major:	2
Leadership:	2

NOTE: One university uses "Principal" for the top category of $5,000,000 and above, "Leadership" for $1,000,000-$5,000,000, and "Major" for $100,000-$1,000,000. Another uses "Principal" for $1,000,000 and above, "Major" for $250,000-$1,000,000, and "Leadership" for $50,000-$250,000.

2. **What is the minimum gift that qualifies for your lowest major gifts category?** (6 respondents)

$25,000:	1
$50,000:	1
$100,000:	2
Other:	
$1,000 -	1
$10,000 -	1

3. **Has your definition of major gifts levels changed since 1983?** (6 respondents)

Yes:	4
No:	2

4. **If yes, what was your previous definition?** (4 respondents)

- "$10,000 as in the last year of 1971-81 campaign."
- "Major gifts were $25,000-$5,000,000; now it's $100,000-$1,000,000 with new category of leadership gifts now $1,000,000-$5,000,000. Principal gifts remain $5,000,000 and above."
- "$50,000 (now $100,000)."
- "It is in the process of being raised."

5. **What percentage of your major gifts do you receive in each of the following forms?** (6 respondents)

Cash:	15% - 1
	39.1% - 1
	58% - 1
	60% - 1
	85.1% - 1
	90% - 1
Stocks:	0% - 2
	6.8% - 1
	7.5% - 1
	10% - 1
	39% - 1
	70% - 1
In-kind:	0% - 2
	1.6% - 1
	3% - 3
Planned instruments:	5% - 1
	6.5% - 1
	10% - 1
	30% - 1
	53.4% - 1
Other: Included in above - 1	

6. **What percentage is received from:** (6 respondents)

Alumni:	8.9% - 1
	14% - 1
	30% - 1
	44.5% - 1
	53.2% - 1
	77.2% - 1
Parents:	0% - 1
	.5% - 1
	.6% - 1
	.8% - 1
	2.1% - 1
	10% - 1
Nonalumni/friends:	.5% - 1
	10% - 1
	11.9% - 1
	13% - 1
	33% - 1
	43% - 1

Corporations:	.8% - 1
	2% - 1
	10% - 2
	39.5% - 1
	41.1% - 1
Foundations:	1% - 1
	8.4% - 1
	15% - 1
	30.4% - 1
	40% - 1
	43% - 1
Other:	5.6% - 1

7. **What percentage is received from:** (4 respondents)

Board members:	1% - 1
	10% - 1
	12.6% - 1
	13% - 1
Former board:	2% - 1
	6.8% - 1
	18% - 1
	N/A - 1

8. **Of the major gifts received, what percentage comes in the form of the following:** (6 respondents)

a) Pooled income fund:	0% - 4
	.6% - 1
	5% - 1
b) Lead trusts:	0% - 5
	2.5% - 1
c) Charitable remainder trusts:	0% - 3
	10% - 1
	36.7% - 1
	52.2% - 1
d) Bequests:	0% - 1
	5% - 1
	20% - 1
	27.6% - 1
	33% - 1
	33.1% - 1

e) Cash or convertible securities:	0% - 1 14.7% - 1 25.6% - 1 62% - 1 70% - 1 90% - 1
f) Combination:	0% - 3 5% - 1 7% - 1 100% - 1
g) Other:	0% - 6

9. If the answer is "f," please indicate your estimated percentage received as: (1 respondent)

a) Cash:	95% - 1
b) Planned Instruments:	5% - 1

MAJOR GIFT RESEARCH

10. How important do you consider prospect research to be in your major gifts? (6 respondents)

Very important:	4
Important:	2
Somewhat important:	0
Not important:	0

11. Approximately what percentage of your major gifts prospects was identified by each method? (6 respondents)

Referral:	5% - 2 10% - 1 15% - 1 20% - 1 40% - 1
Geodemographic screening:	0% - 5 5% - 1
Internal prospect research:	5% - 2 25% - 1 30% - 1 40% - 1 50% - 1

Field screening:		10% - 1 40% - 1 50% - 1 60% - 2 85% - 1
Other:	Long-time accumulation	40% - 1

12. **What is the size of your prospect research staff?** (6 respondents)

None:	0
1-3:	5
4-6:	0
7-9:	1
10 or more:	0

13. **Do you feel that you have adequate research help?** (6 respondents)

Yes:	3
No:	3

14. **Do you have a computerized system for tracking prospects?** (6 respondents)

Yes:	5
No:	1 (being developed)

15. **Please rate the intensity of your major gifts effort by circling the appropriate number:** (6 respondents)

In a campaign:	
Very intense:	5
Intense:	1
Somewhat intense:	0
Not intense:	0
First year out of campaign:	
Very intense:	2
Intense:	2
Somewhat intense:	1
Not intense:	1
More than one year out:	
Very intense:	1
Intense:	4
Somewhat intense:	1
Not intense:	0

16. **Approximately what percentage of your major gifts prospects are evaluated and rated by:** (6 respondents)

Volunteers:	0% - 3
	5% - 1
	10% - 1
	55% - 1
Staff:	0% - 1
	20% - 1
	40% - 1
	65% - 1
	70% - 1
	80% - 1
Staff with volunteers:	20% - 1
	25% - 3
	60% - 1
	100% - 1

Please include any comments.

- "Senior staff establish close relationships with volunteers and thus bring back useful donor/prospect information."

MAJOR GIFTS STAFFING AND SOLICITATION

17. **Is your major gift operation structured as:** (6 respondents)

a) Office of Major Gifts: 2

b) Office of Major/Planned Gifts: 0

c) Separate offices for each category: 4

18. **If separate offices, describe briefly how planned giving interfaces with other major gifts work?**

- "Major gifts officers go to planned giving staff with requests for specific information for a specific donor/prospect."
- "Planned giving officer serves as a support resource."
- "Planned gifts staff are lawyers and handle referrals from major gifts field officers as well as receiving direct inquiries."
- "Directors of development in the schools are the major gifts staff. A director of planned giving supports them."

19. **Do you have one or more major gifts officers currently working in your office?** (6 respondents)

Yes:	6
No:	0

20. **If yes, how many?** (6 respondents)

1-3:	0
4-6:	4
7-9:	0
10 or more:	2

21. **If no, who is responsible for staffing major gifts?**

22. **How many major gifts donors and prospects are managed by one development officer?** (6 respondents)

10 or fewer:	0
11-50:	0
51-100:	4
101-200:	1
over 200:	1

23. **Are you currently in a campaign?** (6 respondents)

Yes:	5
No:	1

24. **If yes, did you hire or increase your major gifts staff at the start of the campaign?** (5 respondents)

Yes:	5
No:	0

25. **Will you retain your current level of major gifts staffing at the completion of your campaign?** (5 respondents)

Yes:	3
No, will reduce it:	1
No, will eliminate it:	0
Don't know yet:	1

26. To what degree is each person responsible for securing a major gift? (6 respondents)

President: (weighted average 4.3)

1:	0
2:	1
3:	0
4:	0
5:	5

Chief development officer: (4.7)

1:	0
2:	0
3:	1
4:	0
5:	5

Dean: (3.5)

1:	0
2:	1
3:	2
4:	2
5:	1

Major gifts officer: (4.2)

1:	0
2:	1
3:	0
4:	2
5:	3

Development officers: (3.2)

1:	0
2:	1
3:	0
4:	3
5:	1
Not ranked:	1

Trustees: (3.8)

1:	0
2:	1
3:	1
4:	2
5:	2

Volunteers (alumni or other): (3.2)

1:	0
2:	1
3:	4
4:	0
5:	1

Faculty member: (2.3)

1:	2
2:	2
3:	1
4:	0
5:	1

27. **Of your institution's top three gifts in the past five years, who did the asking?** (6 respondents)

Gift #1: Amount:	Title of Asker:
$70,000,000	President
$20,000,000	CDO with others
$12,000,000	President
$10,000,000	President
$8,000,000	PGO/President
$7,800,000	President

Gift #2: Amount:	Title of Asker:
$50,000,000	Pres./Trustee/DO
$12,000,000	Dean
$6,000,000	President
$6,000,000	President
$5,000,000	Pres./Vice President
$2,500,000	Trustee/Pres./VP, Dev.

Gift #3: Amount:	Title of Asker:
$25,000,000	Trustee Self-solicitation
$7,500,000	Chanc., Health Affairs
$5,000,000	President
$5,000,000	President
$2,000,000	Trustee
$1,000,000	Trustee/President

28. a) **Since 1983, has your use of volunteers in major gift solicitation increased or decreased?** (6 respondents)

Increased:	6
Decreased:	0

28. b) **Since 1983, what is your estimated percentage of increase or decrease of use of volunteers in major gift solicitation?** (6 respondents)

5% increase:	0
10% increase:	1
25% increase:	2
50% increase:	2
100% increase:	1
5% decrease:	0
10% decrease:	0
25% decrease:	0
50% decrease:	0
100% decrease:	0

29. **Since 1983, approximately what percentage of major gifts were secured by volunteers?** (6 respondents)

10%:	4
25%:	0
50%:	1
Other, specify:	
Volunteer/staff team, 75%:	1

30. **Since 1983, approximately what percentage of major gifts were secured by the president?** (6 respondents)

10%:	1
25%:	1
50%:	1
Other, specify:	
< 10%:	1
60%:	1
80%:	1

31. **Since 1983, approximately what percentage of major gifts were secured by the development staff?** (6 respondents)

10%:	1
25%:	1
50%:	2
Other, specify:	
20%:	1
40%:	1

32. **Do you usually send more than one solicitor on a major gifts solicitation call?** (6 respondents)

Yes:	5
No:	1

33. **If yes, what is the most usual combination?** (5 respondents)

President/Trustee:	1
President/Chief Development Officer:	1
Chief Development Officer/Trustee:	1
Chief Development Officer/Volunteer:	1
Other: Dev. staff with vol./faculty:	1

ENDOWMENT PROGRAM

34. **Do you have a range of named endowments for endowed funds?** (6 respondents)

Yes:	6
No:	0

35. **If yes, what is your minimum for an endowed professorship?** (6 respondents)

$2,000,000:	1
$1,600,000:	1
$1,000,000:	3
$500,000:	1

36. **If your minimum negotiable?** (6 respondents)

Yes:	2
No:	4

37. **If yes, please explain to what degree.**

- "Present value--negotiate faster payment than five years; very infrequent."
- "Can be higher."

38. **Do you have multiple levels of faculty positions that can be endowed?** (6 respondents)

Yes:	5
No:	1

39. **If yes, please list them with the amount required for endowment:**

Position	Endowment Required
Career Development Chair	$750,000
Chair	$1,000,000
Chair	$1,500,000
Faculty Scholar	$800,000
Fellowship	$500,000
Professorship	$500,000
Professorship	$1,000,000
Professorship	$1,600,000
Professorship	$2,000,000
Research Chair	$1,500,000
Visiting Professor	$500,000

40. **What percentage of the endowment income for an endowed professorship is used for salaries?** (6 respondents)

100%:	3
85%:	1
80%:	2

41. **When do you fill your endowed professorships?** (6 respondents)

At time of pledge:	0
50% funded:	2
100% funded:	1
Other, specify:	
33% funded and binding pledge:	1
60% funded:	1
when 100% pledged:	1

42. **Do you fill a chair now for a gift subject to life income?** (6 respondents)

Yes:	1
No:	5

43. **Do you fill a chair now for a documented bequest provision?** (6 respondents)

Yes:	0
No:	6

44. **Do you market endowments for other than full professorships?** (6 respondents)

Yes:	4
No:	2

45. **If yes, please list for what positions and the endowment required:**

Position	Endowment Required
Chair	$1,000,000
Faculty Scholar	$800,000
Lectureship	$300,000
Visiting Professor	Varies

46. **Do you actively promote endowments for other purposes or programs?** (6 respondents)

Yes:	6
No:	0

47. **If yes, please list for what purpose or program and the size of the endowment required:**

Purpose or Program	Endowment Required
Center	$2,000,000
Department Research Fund	$500,000
Faculty Incentives	$200,000
Financial Aid--Grad. & Undergrad.	$50,000 plus
Fund	$100,000 plus
Institute	$3,000,000
Library Acquisitions	$10,000
Program	$1,000,000
Research-teaching Programs	varies, from $50,000
Scholarships	$150,000
Various Purposes	$10,000

NAMING OPPORTUNITIES

48. **Do you have capital or other naming opportunities?** (6 respondents)

Yes:	6
No:	0

49. Do you have a specific set of policies regarding naming opportunities? (6 respondents)

Yes:	6
No:	0

50. If you have a policy, to what extent is it negotiable?

- "Subject to review by board of regents."
- "Negotiable when existing buildings are involved."
- "Moderately."
- "Only a little. We will take into account special circumstances regarding donor and/or financial requirements."
- "Not negotiable."
- "It is somewhat negotiable on facilities. On endowment, policy is not negotiable with respect to amount required, but payment period is variable."

51. If you have no specific policy in that regard, what is your practice?

52. What percentage of the total cost of a capital project must be covered to name a building? (6 respondents)

50%:	4
55%:	1
60%:	1

53. Do you include long-term maintenance costs in this projection? (6 respondents)

Yes:	3
No:	3

54. In practice, is your effort to raise such an endowment working? Please explain.

- "Works well with the exception of building projects."
- "Yes, gifts for capital projects are increasing; however, we do not raise funds for long-term maintenance."
- "We have made a few tries with middling success so far, usually for special projects like a fountain or the church."
- "Yes. Most nameable units (physical) named. Making good progress on non-physical, such as scholarships, departmental endowments, and professorships."

55. **If yes, what is the percentage of the total project endowment?** (2 respondents)

25%:	2

56. **Since 1983, have you found fund raising for capital projects to be:** (6 respondents)

Easier:	0
More difficult:	3
About the same:	3

Please explain.

- "Easier to get commitments, but more difficult to raise all the money due to big increases in costs of facilities."
- "Funding for capital projects has always been difficult to secure."
- "Higher building costs are a factor. Now it usually requires more than one donor to complete a project."
- "Probably capital projects have been more difficult because in 1982-88 the emphasis was totally on endowment. It's only in the last two years that we have begun to emphasize both."
- "Sixty percent of the inflated building costs is beyond the potential or consideration of most donors."

INSTITUTIONAL INFORMATION

57. **For what type of institution do you work?**

Private/Independent:	6

58. **Is your institution church-affiliated?**

Yes:	2
No:	4

59. **Is your institution:**

Four-year plus grad. prog. and/or prof. sch.:	2
A research university:	4

60. **What is the undergraduate student enrollment at your institution?**

Under 2,000:	1
2,000 - 4,999:	0
5,000 - 9,999:	2
10,000 - 14,999:	2
15,000 - 19,999:	1

RESPONDENT INSTITUTIONS

Baylor University
Duke University
The George Washington University
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Stanford University
Washington & Lee University

Chapter 4

Public Universities

Twelve public universities responded to the major gifts questionnaire. Six described their institutions as research universities, and six termed their universities "four-year institutions plus graduate programs and/or professional schools."

The responding institutions' enrollments varied widely. One had an enrollment of between 5,000 and 9,999 students, and another had an enrollment of between 10,000 and 14,999. Two enrolled between 15,000 and 19,999 students; four, between 20,000 and 24,999 students; and another four, 25,000 or more students.

Only two of the 12 public universities participating in this study were included in CASE's 1983 survey of major gift policies and practices.

Major gifts defined

As donors and prospective donors become involved in the ongoing life of their institutions, a common vocabulary among the professional staff becomes more important. The first set of survey questions sought to determine if fund-raising professionals at the respondent public universities are speaking the same language when they talk about major gifts to donors and prospects.

Seven of the 12 public universities use "major" to describe their larger gifts. Three institutions call them "leadership gifts," and two institutions use the word "special."

Six of the 12 institutions reported that the minimum required for a major gift was $10,000. Two institutions required $25,000. Other minimums required are $5,000, $17,000, $50,000, and $100,000--each by one institution.

Seven of the 12 respondents have changed their definition of major gifts since 1983. Six increased their minimums, and one established a major gift minimum for the first time.

The universities were asked to break down the form in which they received their major gifts into cash, stocks, in-kind donations, and planned instruments. The 11 universities responding said that they received an average 72 percent of the gifts in cash; 13 percent in stocks; 9 percent in planned instruments; and 6 percent in in-kind donations.

Where are the gifts coming from? The universities analyzed their major gifts by donor--alumni, parents, nonalumni/friends, corporations, and foundations. These public universities received the largest proportion of their gifts from alumni--an average of 30 percent. The next largest source was corporations--28 percent (the largest percentage from corporations of any institutional group in the survey). Foundations gave the public universities an average of 20 percent, and nonalumni/friends gave 20 percent. Only two universities reported receiving gifts from parents (1 percent each); this amounted to less than 1 percent of the overall public university total. (Sources add to 99 percent due to rounding.)

How much of the gift money comes from board and former board members? Eight universities reported receiving major gifts from board members and six from former board members. Overall, board members contributed 5 percent of the major gifts to 12 universities in the sample; 1 percent came from former board members.

The institutions broke down major gifts by the percentages received in cash and in various forms of planned gifts. The greatest percentage of major gifts to the public universities came in cash or convertible securities--an average of 66 percent. Among various planned giving vehicles, bequests were the most fruitful source of major gifts. Public universities received 8 percent of their major gifts from this source. Gifts from charitable remainder trusts averaged 5 percent. Overall, pooled income funds and lead trusts each amounted to less than 1 percent of these universities' major gift income.

Six universities reported receiving percentages ranging from 2 to 100 percent of their major gifts in a combination of cash or convertible securities and planned instruments; the four responding institutions that broke this down said that 90 percent was received in cash/convertible securities and 10 percent in planned instruments. Overall, combination gifts amounted to 20 percent of the public university major gift total.

One institution indicated that property accounted for 15 percent of its major gift income; this amounted to 1 percent of the public university total.

Major gift research

How important is prospect research to the major gift programs at these public universities? Eight consider it very important; three responded that it is important; and one said it is somewhat important. No university responded that it was unimportant.

Many methods of prospect research are available, but respondents were asked to approximate the percentage of prospects identified by four methods--referral, geodemographic screening, internal prospect research, and field screening. Respondents could also write in other methods.

All 12 public universities responded to this question. Overall, they used internal prospect research to identify 33 percent of their major gift prospects; referral, 30 percent; field screenings, 22 percent; and geodemographic screening, 8 percent. Under "Other," one institution indicated that it identified 80 percent of its major gift prospects through marketing (this amounted to 7 percent of the public university total).

The size of the prospect research staff significantly affects the research methods used by an institution. Two of the universities have no prospect research staff. Five have from one to three prospect researchers, four have four to six, and one has seven to nine. None of the institutions has 10 or more researchers. Only three of the 12 universities feel that they have adequate research help. All of the respondents have a computerized system for tracking prospects.

Public institutions responded to three questions relating to the intensity of their major gift effort during and following a campaign. When asked to rate the intensity of their major gift efforts during a campaign, 10 universities responded: Eight said the efforts were very intense, one judged them intense, and one said they were somewhat intense. Asked to assess the intensity of major gift efforts one year out of a campaign, six universities responded: One rated the efforts very intense, two said they were intense, and three called them somewhat intense.

Eight universities rated their major gift efforts more than a year after a campaign. Two said their efforts remained very intense, four said they were intense, and two said they were somewhat intense.

The task of evaluating and rating major gift prospects can be handled by a variety of people--staff, staff and volunteers, and volunteers. Staff evaluate and rate an average of 56 percent of the major gift prospects of public universities in the sample; staff with volunteers, 36.5 percent; and volunteers alone, 7.5 percent. Six universities do not use volunteers alone to evaluate and rate any of their prospects; one uses staff working with volunteers to do *all* of its prospect evaluation and rating.

Major gift staffing and solicitation

Of the 11 universities responding to the question about structuring of the major gift operation, eight have separate offices for major gifts and planned gifts, and three have a combined Office of Major/Planned Gifts. The institutions that have separate offices indicate that the two offices work closely together. One university said, "Planned giving is included in major gift reviews. Computer tracking is integrated." At another institution, "The planned giving officer works with constituent development officers to coordinate strategies of major gift prospects." A third said that the offices are integrated under the executive director of development. One respondent said, "The planned giving officer keeps the major gifts officer updated. The planned giving officer is primarily responsible for cultivation, solicitation, negotiation; the major gifts officer for receipts processing."

Eleven of the 12 public universities have one or more major gift officers. Of these, four have one to three major gift officers; four have four to six; and two have seven to nine. Only one university has 10 or more major gift officers; they are stationed in the university's component colleges.

How many major gift donors and prospects are managed by one development officer? At all but one university it's 11 or more. At six universities the figure is 11 to 50, at one university it's 51 to 100, and at three it's 101 to 200. None of the development officers at the public universities manages more than 200 prospects.

Six of 11 responding universities are currently in a campaign. All six of these universities increased their major gift staff at the start of the campaign. Four of the six universities said they would retain the current level of major gift staffing at the completion of the campaign. One university planned to reduce the staff, and one hadn't yet decided.

To what degree are those involved in an institution's fund-raising program responsible for securing major gifts? The survey asked respondents to use a one-to-five scale to rate the degree of major gift responsibility held by the president, chief development officer, dean, major gift officer, development officers, trustees, volunteers, and faculty.

At a weighted average of 4.8 (5 equals maximally responsible), the chief development officer has the greatest major gift responsibility at these public institutions. The president is not too far behind at 4.5. Next are the major gift officer (4.3) and the development officers (4.1). The universities gave the dean and volunteers a higher rating (both 3.3) than trustees and faculty (2.6 and 2.3, respectively).

Each university reported on the top three gifts received in the past five years. Nine of the 34 gifts (26 percent) were secured by the president or chancellor alone. These gifts averaged $3.46 million. Another 11 gifts (32 percent) were obtained by the president teamed with someone else (usually a volunteer or the chief development officer). These gifts averaged $5.64 million. Interestingly, in 14 of the 34 largest gifts the solicitations were done by teams; in 20 cases, an individual made the "ask."

Eleven of 12 respondents have increased their use of volunteers since 1983. When asked to estimate the percentage of increase, four universities reported that their usage of volunteers had doubled; three said it had increased by 50 percent; two reported a 25 percent increase; and one reported a 10 percent increase. The one university that said its volunteer usage had declined reported a 50 percent decrease.

The next three questions related to securing of major gifts in the period between 1983 and 1991. The development staff secured an average of 46 percent of all major gifts (one university put the percentage at 90 percent and two at 65 percent). The president secured an average of 28 percent, and volunteers secured an average of about 23 percent of all major gifts. (Answers accounted for 97 percent of the total major gifts secured.)

Eleven of the 12 universities usually send more than one solicitor on a major gift call. The most common teams are the president and the chief development officer (five universities) and the president and other volunteers (four universities). One university usually sends the president and a trustee, and one reports that its most-used team consists of the chief development officer and another volunteer (not a trustee).

Endowment program

All 12 universities have a range of named endowments. For endowed professorships, the minimums ranged from $100,000 (one university) to $1.5 million (one university) with five universities reporting a minimum of $250,000 and two, $500,000. Seven of the 12 universities said that the minimum was not negotiable; five said that it was. "It is negotiable for gifts in areas where the market demand for faculty is not keen," said one respondent, who pointed out that "$300,000 in an endowment for a professorship in sociology or geography has as much impact as a $500,000 professorship in civil engineering."

All the universities have multiple levels of faculty positions that can be endowed. The lowest minimum endowment is $100,000 for an endowed assistant professorship or a scholar-in-residence; the highest, $1.5 million for an endowed chair (professorship).

The percentage of the endowment income used for salaries varied among the 10 responding public universities. The range was from 75 to 100 percent of income from the endowment, with three using 100 percent and three saying the percentage varies. (Most institutions have a policy of spending a set percent of endowment principal--say 5 or 6 percent--on the endowment's purpose; any remainder is retained in the principal to prevent its erosion by inflation. For example, an institution receiving a 7 percent yield and spending 5 percent would be using 71 percent of the endowment's income.)

Ten of the 12 universities fill an endowed professorship when it is fully funded. Only one university fills it at the time of pledge. None of the universities fills a chair now for a gift subject to life income or for a documented bequest provision.

Ten of the 12 respondent universities market endowments for purposes other than full professorships. Other positions for which public universities seek endowments include scientist, librarian, assistant and associate professor, junior faculty, and graduate assistant/intern. Amounts range from $25,000 (lectureship) to $1 million (scientist, librarian, assistant or associate professor).

Eleven of the universities actively promote endowments for other purposes or programs. Scholarships were mentioned eight times with required endowments ranging from $10,000 to $35,000. Fellowships were mentioned six times with minimum endowments ranging from $10,000 to $100,000.

Naming opportunities

Eleven of the 12 universities have capital or other naming opportunities. Nine have specific policies regarding naming opportunities. These are sometimes negotiable, depending on the donor and the size of the gift; the decision is usually made by the president and trustees. One university described its approach as "some flexibility, but must keep in context with other similar naming opportunities." A university that has no formal policy indicated that the endowment must be large enough to support 50 percent of the program; another submits endowment requests to the trustees on an ad hoc basis.

When asked what percentage of the total cost must be covered to name a building, four universities responded 50 percent. Two universities each answered 51, 33, and 25 percent.

Only two of 12 responding public universities include long-term maintenance costs in the projection. When asked if this type of endowment raising program has worked, one university responded yes. "We put in place a $1.5 million endowment for Alumni Center maintenance." Another said its experience had varied: "We are new at it."

Is it easier to raise money for capital projects now than it was in 1983? Only one university thought so; nine found it about the same; and two said it was harder. "Even though our region still suffers the effects of a depressed economy, our fund-raising success has been balanced by positive donor relationships established during a capital campaign in the early- to mid-1980s," said one respondent. Another university commented, "During our $352 million six-year campaign (ended 6/30/90), we had anticipated that we would have more problems raising money for capital projects. This assumption was false."

Public Universities

MAJOR GIFTS DEFINED

1. **What word best describes your larger gifts?** (12 respondents)

Major:	7
Leadership:	3
Special:	2

2. **What is the minimum gift that qualifies for your lowest major gifts category?** (12 respondents)

$25,000:	2
$50,000:	1
$100,000:	1
Other:	
$5,000:	1
$10,000:	6
$17,000:	1

3. **Has your definition of major gifts levels changed since 1983?**

Yes:	7
No:	5

4. **If yes, what was your previous definition?** (7 respondents)

- "No previous definition. Leadership minimum was established for current campaign."
- "$1,000 (now $5,000)."
- "$5,000 (now $10,000)."
- "Life insurance, gifts-in-kind, and estate gift levels have been raised."
- "Increased base from $5,000 to $10,000."
- "Minimum is up from $10,000 (now $25,000)."
- "Previously it was $10,000 (now $17,000)."

5. **What percentage of your major gifts do you receive in each of the following forms?** (11 respondents)

Cash:	40% - 1
	55% - 1
	62% - 1
	65% - 1
	69% - 1

	75% - 1
	80% - 2
	81% - 1
	90% - 1
	99.56% - 1
Stocks:	.16% - 1
	1% - 1
	4% - 1
	5% - 1
	8% - 1
	10% - 2
	20% - 3
	40% - 1
In-kind:	0% - 1
	.09% - 1
	2% - 1
	5% - 3
	6% - 1
	7% - 1
	9% - 1
	10% - 1
	15% - 1
Planned instruments:	0% - 2
	.19% - 1
	5% - 1
	10% - 4
	11% - 1
	15% - 1
	30% - 1

6. **What percentage is received from:** (12 respondents)

Alumni:	6.5% - 1
	8% - 2
	14% - 1
	16% - 1
	20% - 1
	22% - 1
	26% - 1
	50% - 2
	62% - 1
	75% - 1
Parents:	0% or not applicable - 10
	1% - 2

Nonalumni/friends:	5% - 1
	6% - 1
	13.4% - 1
	14% - 1
	15% - 1
	17% - 1
	19% - 1
	23% - 1
	28% - 2
	32% - 1
	40% - 1
Corporations:	5% - 1
	8% - 1
	10% - 1
	11% - 1
	14% - 1
	22% - 1
	34% - 2
	41% - 1
	41.3% - 1
	50% - 1
	60% - 1
Foundations:	1% - 1
	5% - 2
	10% - 1
	14% - 1
	15% - 1
	20% - 2
	28% - 1
	35% - 1
	37% - 1
	55% - 1
Other: Miscellaneous:	0% - 10
	1% - 1
	2% - 1

7. **What percentage is received from:** (12 respondents)

Board members:	0% - 4
	1% - 1
	2% - 2
	5% - 1
	9% - 1
	10% - 1
	16% - 1
	20% - 1
Former board members:	0% - 6
	<1% - 2
	1% - 2

8. **Of the major gifts received, what percentage comes in the form of the following:** (11 respondents)

a) Pooled income fund:	0% or see "f" - 7
	.01% - 1
	.05% - 2
	10% - 1
b) Lead trusts:	0% or see "f" - 9
	.2% - 1
	1% - 1
c) Charitable remainder trusts:	0% or see "f" - 4
	.5% - 1
	1% - 1
	2% - 1
	5% - 1
	9.5% - 1
	10% - 1
	22% - 1
d) Bequests:	0% or see "f" - 2
	1% - 1
	5% - 1
	6% - 1
	7% - 1
	9.2% - 1
	10% - 2
	20% - 2
e) Cash or convertible securities:	0% or see "f" - 2
	60% - 1
	65% - 1
	70% - 1
	80% - 1
	82% - 1
	83% - 1
	88% - 1
	95% - 1
	98% - 1
f) Combination:	0% or see "f" - 5
	2% - 1
	4% - 1
	8% - 1
	10% - 1
	100% - 2
g) Other: Property:	0% - 10
	15% - 1

9. **If the answer is "f," please indicate your estimated percentage received as:** (4 respondents)

a) Cash:	90% - 4
b) Planned instruments:	10% - 4

MAJOR GIFT RESEARCH

10. **How important do you consider prospect research to be in your major gifts?** (12 respondents)

Very important:	8
Important:	3
Somewhat important:	1
Not important:	0

11. **Approximately what percentage of your major gifts prospects was identified by each method?** (12 respondents)

Referral:	5%	2
	10%	4
	20%	1
	30%	1
	35%	1
	60%	1
	75%	1
	90%	1
Geodemographic screening:	0%	5
	5%	3
	10%	1
	15%	2
	40%	1
Internal prospect research:	5%	1
	10%	4
	20%	1
	30%	1
	35%	1
	50%	2
	80%	1
	90%	1
Field screening:	0%	4
	5%	1
	10%	1
	20%	1
	35%	2
	40%	2
	80%	1
Other: Marketing:	80%	1

12. **What is the size of your prospect research staff?** (12 respondents)

None:	2
1-3:	5
4-6:	4
7-9:	1
10 or more:	0

13. **Do you feel that you have adequate research help?** (12 respondents)

Yes:	3
No:	9

14. **Do you have a computerized system for tracking prospects?** (12 respondents)

Yes:	12
No:	0

15. **Please rate the intensity of your major gifts effort by circling the appropriate number:** (11 respondents)

In a campaign:	
Very intense:	8
Intense:	1
Somewhat intense:	1
Not intense:	0
Not ranked:	1
First year out of campaign:	
Very intense:	1
Intense:	2
Somewhat intense:	3
Not intense:	0
Not ranked:	5
More than one year out:	
Very intense:	2
Intense:	4
Somewhat intense:	2
Not intense:	0
Not ranked:	3

16. **Approximately what percentage of your major gifts prospects are evaluated and rated by:** (12 respondents)

Volunteers:	0%	6
	10%	4
	25%	2
Staff:	0%	1
	10%	1
	25%	2
	50%	2
	65%	1
	70%	1
	90%	2
	100%	2
Staff with volunteers:	0%	2
	10%	2
	15%	1
	18%	1
	40%	2
	50%	1
	75%	1
	80%	1
	100%	1
Other: Electronic screening:	2%	1

MAJOR GIFTS STAFFING AND SOLICITATION

17. **Is your major gifts operation structured as:** (11 respondents)

a) Office of Major Gifts: 0

b) Office of Major/Planned Gifts: 3

c) Separate offices for each category: 8

18. **If separate offices, describe briefly how planned giving interfaces with other major gift work?**

- "They have joint duties in several instances."
- "The planned giving officer works with constituent development officers to coordinate strategies of major gift prospects."
- "Planned giving is included in major gifts reviews. Computer tracking is integrated."
- "Offices are integrated under executive director of development."
- "Prospects are assigned to each office; sometimes there is a double ask."
- "The planned giving officer keeps the major gifts officer updated. The planned giving officer is primarily responsible for cultivation, solicitation, negotiation; the major gifts officer is responsible for receipts processing."
- "Activities coordinated with development officers and chief development officers. Manages a few major gift prospects but primarily supports development officers/management."

19. Do you have one or more major gifts officers currently working in your office? (12 respondents)

Yes:	11
No:	1

20. If yes, how many? (11 respondents)

1-3:	4
4-6:	4
7-9:	2
10 or more:	1

21. If no, who is responsible for staffing major gifts?

- "Development officers in each unit/school managed by a central executive director."

22. How many major gifts donors and prospects are managed by one development officer? (11 respondents)

10 or fewer:	1
11-50:	6
51-100:	1
101-200:	3
over 200:	0

23. Are you currently in a campaign? (11 respondents)

Yes:	6
No:	5

24. If yes, did you hire or increase your major gifts staff at the start of the campaign? (6 respondents)

Yes:	6
No:	0

25. Will you retain your current level of major gifts staffing at the completion of your campaign? (6 respondents)

Yes:	4
No, will reduce it:	1
No, will eliminate it:	0
Don't know yet:	1

26. To what degree is each person responsible for securing a major gift? (12 respondents)

President: (weighted average 4.5)

1:	0
2:	1
3:	1
4:	1
5:	9

Chief development officer: (4.8)

1:	0
2:	0
3:	0
4:	2
5:	10

Dean: (3.3)

1:	0
2:	2
3:	5
4:	4
5:	1

Major gifts officer: (4.3)

1:	0
2:	0
3:	1
4:	5
5:	4
Not ranked:	2

Development officers: (4.1)

1:	0
2:	0
3:	3
4:	4
5:	4
Not ranked:	1

Trustees: (2.6)

1:	0
2:	7
3:	3
4:	0
5:	1
Not ranked:	1

Volunteers (alumni or other): (3.3)

1:	1
2:	2
3:	5
4:	1
5:	3

Faculty member: (2.3)

1:	2
2:	6
3:	2
4:	2
5:	0

27. **Of your institution's top three gifts in the past five years, who did the asking?**

Gift #1: Amount:	Title of Asker:
$15,000,000	President
$12,000,000	IUF Staff/Univ. Ad.
$11,600,000	Donor
$10,000,000	Pres./Vol./CDO
$5,000,000	Pres./Campaign Chair
$4,000,000	President
$2,100,000	CDO
$2,000,000	President
$1,500,000	VP, Agriculture
$1,500,000	Chancellor
$1,300,000	CDO
$1,000,000	Chancellor

Gift #2: Amount:	Title of Asker:
$11,000,000	IUF Staff
$10,000,000	Pres./Vol./CDO
$10,000,000	Pres./Dean/CDO
$3,500,000	Pres./Campaign Chair
$3,500,000	Pres./Campaign Chair
$2,000,000	Vol./Trustee/DO
$2,000,000	Chancellor/Dean
$2,000,000	VP, Foundation
$2,000,000	Golf Coach
$2,000,000	President
$1,000,000	Chancellor
Miscellaneous	CDO

Gift #3: Amount:	Title of Asker:
$10,000,000	Volunteer
$9,000,000	Pres./Vol./CDO
$4,500,000	Dean/Pres./Donor
$3,000,000	Staff Member
$2,600,000	Chancellor
$2,500,000	Pres./Campaign Chair
$2,000,000	President
$2,000,000	President/Volunteer
$1,200,000	Department/Chair
$1,000,000	Athletic Director
$1,000,000	PGO
Miscellaneous	CDO

28. a) **Since 1983, has your use of volunteers in major gifts solicitation increased or decreased?** (12 respondents)

Increased:	11
Decreased:	1

28. b) **Since 1983, what is your estimated percentage of increase or decrease of use of volunteers in major gifts solicitation?** (11 respondents)

5% increase:	0
10% increase:	1
25% increase:	2
50% increase:	3
100% increase:	4
5% decrease:	0
10% decrease:	0
25% decrease:	0
50% decrease:	1
100% decrease:	0

29. **Since 1983, approximately what percentage of major gifts were secured by volunteers?** (11 respondents)

10%:	2
25%:	5
50%:	2
Other, specify:	
<5%:	1
0%:	1

30. **Since 1983, approximately what percentage of major gifts were secured by the president?** (11 respondents)

10%:	3
25%:	5
50%:	3

31. **Since 1983, approximately what percentage of major gifts were secured by the development staff?** (12 respondents)

25%:	4
50%:	5
Other, specify:	
65%:	2
90%:	1

32. **Do you usually send more than one solicitor on a major gifts solicitation call?**

Yes:	11
No:	1

33. **If yes, what is the most usual combination?** (11 respondents)

President/Trustee:	1
President/Chief Development Officer:	5
President/Other Volunteer:	4
Chief Development Officer/Trustee:	0
Chief Development Officer/Volunteer:	1

ENDOWMENT PROGRAM

34. **Do you have a range of named endowments for endowed funds?** (12 respondents)

Yes:	12
No:	0

35. **If yes, what is your minimum for an endowed professorship?** (12 respondents)

$1,500,000:	1
$1,000,000:	1
$ 500,000:	2
$ 300,000:	1
$ 250,000:	5
$ 200,000:	1
$ 100,000:	1

36. Is your minimum negotiable? (12 respondents)

Yes:	5
No:	7

37. If yes, please explain to what degree.

- "Down to $300,000 to $400,000, although we are getting more stringent about this."
- "We have six endowed professorships that range in size from $100,000 to $600,000."
- "It is negotiable for gifts in areas where the market demand for faculty is not keen: $300,000 in an endowment for a professorship in sociology or geography has as much impact as a $500,000 professorship in civil engineering."

38. Do you have multiple levels of faculty positions that can be endowed? (12 respondents)

Yes:	12
No:	0

39. If yes, please list them with the amount required for endowment.

Position	Endowment Required
Assistant Professorship	$100,000
Assistant/Associate Professor	$250,000
Associate Professorship	$200,000
Cap endowment on existing line	$750,000
Chair	$500,000
Chair	$500,000
Chair	$1,000,000
Chair	$1,000,000
Chair	$1,000,000
Chair	$1,000,000
Chair	$1,000,000
Chair	$1,000,000-$1,500,000
Distinguished Teaching Professorship	$250,000
Distinguished Professor	$500,000
Distinguished Professor	$200,000
Distinguished Service Professorship	$750,000
Faculty Fellowship	$50,000
Fellowship	$100,000
Full Endowment	$1,500,000
Lectureship	$250,000
Presidential Chair	$1,250,000
Professor	$300,000
Professorial Chair	$1,000,000
Professorship	$500,000
Professorship	$400,000-$500,000

Professorship	$500,000
Professorship	$100,000
Professorship	$250,000
Professorship	$250,000
Professorships	$250,000
Scholar in Residence	$100,000
Scholars	$350,000

40. What percentage of the endowment income for an endowed professorship is used for salaries? (10 respondents)

- Varies:	3
- 100%:	3
- 85-100%:	1
- 80%:	1
- 75%:	1
- Not set yet:	1

41. When do you fill your endowed professorships? (12 respondents)

At time of pledge:	1
50% funded:	0
100% funded:	10
Other: Varies:	1

42. Do you fill a chair now for a gift subject to life income? (12 respondents)

Yes:	0
No:	12

43. Do you fill a chair now for a documented bequest provision? (12 respondents)

Yes:	0
No:	12

44. Do you market endowments for other than full professorships? (12 respondents)

Yes:	10
No:	2

45. **If yes, please list for what positions and the endowment required:**

Position	Endowment Required
Award	$50,000
Cap Endowment on Existing Line	$750,000
Chair/Scientist/Librarian	$1,000,000
Chairs	$1,000,000
Faculty Fellowship	$50,000
Fellowship	$100,000
Fellowship	$100,000
Fellowship	$50,000
Fellowship	$50,000
Fellowship--Asst. or Assoc. Prof.	$1,000,000
Full-tuition Scholarship	$35,000
Fund	$10,000
Graduate Assistant/Intern	$50,000
Junior Faculty	$300,000
Lectureship	$25,000
Lectureship	$25,000
Lecture Series	$100,000
Named Librarian	$100,000
Professorship	$1,000,000
Scholarship/Loan	$10,000

46. **Do you actively promote endowments for other purposes or programs?** (11 respondents)

Yes:	11
No:	0

47. **If yes, please list for what purpose or program and the size of the endowment required:**

Purpose or Program	Endowment Required
Artist in Residence	$100,000
Awards	$5,000
Endowed Equipment Fund/Lab	$50,000-$1,000,000
Enhancement Funds for Department	$10,000
Fellowship	$50,000
Graduate Fellowship	$50,000
Graduate Fellowship	$100,000
Lectureship	$25,000
Lectureship	$100,000
Presidential Scholarship	$25,000
President's Distinguished Scholar	$50,000
Program Support	$10,000
Scholarship	$15,000
Scholarship	$10,000
Scholarship	$10,000

Scholarship	$10,000
Scholarship	$17,000
Scholarship	$30,000
Scholarship/Graduate Fellowship	$10,000
Undergraduate Scholarship	$25,000
Unrestricted Opportunity Fund	$50,000
Visiting Professorship	$100,000

NAMING OPPORTUNITIES

48. Do you have capital or other naming opportunities? (12 respondents)

Yes:	11
No:	1

49. Do you have a specific set of policies regarding naming opportunities? (12 respondents)

Yes:	9
No:	3

50. If you have a policy, to what extent is it negotiable?

- "Naming opportunities are completely negotiable between donor and university officials, except in the case of naming a new building where a $500,000 minimum is necessary."
- "Some flexibility, but must keep in context with other similar naming opportunities in existence."
- "To some degree."
- "Very flexible."
- "[We require] 51 percent of building; could be negotiable if project is small enough. Also we put prices on rooms."
- "Negotiable; no set gift value. Policy states honoree must be deceased five years, but this is also negotiable."
- "Some degree, depending on donor."
- "It is negotiable."

51. If you have no specific policy in that regard, what is your practice?

- "Endowment must be of size to support 50 percent of the program needed."
- "To submit the request to the board of trustees for approval."

52. **What percentage of the total cost of a capital project must be covered to name a building?** (12 respondents)

51%:	2
50%:	4
33%:	2
25%:	2
Varies:	1
N/A:	1

53. **Do you include long-term maintenance costs in this projection?** (12 respondents)

Yes:	2
No:	10

54. **In practice, is your effort to raise such an endowment working? Please explain.**

- "Haven't had to try yet."
- "The one time we did seek it, it worked. We put in place a $1,500,000 endowment for Alumni Center maintenance."
- "Too early to tell."
- "It is varied; we are new at it."
- "Some."

55. **If yes, what is the percentage of the total project endowment?** (0 respondents)

56. **Since 1983, have you found fund raising for capital projects to be:** (12 respondents)

Easier:	1
More difficult:	2
About the same:	9

Please explain.

- "Even though our region still suffers the effects of a depressed economy, our fund-raising success has been balanced by positive donor relationships established during a capital campaign in the early- to mid-1980s."
- "Our capital campaign raised consciousness and visibility of the university. We were able to market ourselves and the quality of our program."
- "Bad economy."
- "During our $352-million six-year campaign (ended June 30, 1990), we had anticipated that we would have more problems raising money for capital projects. This assumption was false."

INSTITUTIONAL INFORMATION

57. For what type of institution do you work?

Public:	12

58. Is your institution church-affiliated?

No:	12

59. Is your institution:

Four-year plus grad. prog. and/or prof. sch.:	6
A research university:	6

60. What is the undergraduate student enrollment at your institution?

5,000-9,999:	1
10,000-14,999:	1
15,000-19,999:	2
20,000-24,999:	4
25,000 or more:	4

RESPONDENT INSTITUTIONS

Ball State University
Indiana University Foundation
New Mexico State University
Oklahoma State University
Pennsylvania State University
Rutgers University Foundation
University of Arkansas
University of Kansas
University of Missouri at Rolla
University of Texas at Austin
University of Utah
West Virginia University Foundation

Chapter 5

Independent Elementary/Secondary Schools

This study includes 15 private elementary and/or secondary schools. Thirteen are independent; two are church-affiliated. All 15 have enrollments of under 2,000 students. Ten of the schools were also included in the 1983 CASE survey of major gifts.

Major gifts defined

As donors and prospective donors become more involved in the ongoing life of their institutions, a common vocabulary among the professional staff becomes more important. The first set of survey questions sought to determine if fund-raising professionals at private elementary and secondary schools are speaking the same language when they talk about major gifts to donors and prospects.

Eight of the 15 schools surveyed responded that "major" describes the larger gifts at their institutions. Six of the respondents use "leadership" to define larger gifts. One school calls major gifts "strategic."

In 1991, the minimum gift required to qualify as a major gift was $25,000 at eight of the 15 schools. One school responded that $50,000 qualified; three respondents said that a minimum gift of $100,000 was required; and another three used $10,000 as the minimum requirement.

Nine of 15 schools reported that their minimum gift requirements for major gifts have changed since 1983. Three institutions had no definition in 1983. One school increased its minimum tenfold--from $10,000 to $100,000, and another doubled its minimum from $50,000 to $100,000. One went from a

$15,000-$25,000 minimum range to a set minimum of $25,000, and another increased from $10,000 to $25,000. One institution was unsure of its 1983 definition but believes it was $50,000; now the school's minimum is $100,000. Only one school *decreased* its minimum--from $25,000 during a campaign to $10,000 now.

In what form are major gifts received? All 15 institutions answered this question; they received an average of 51 percent of their major gifts in cash. The schools also received a significant amount in the form of stocks--40 percent. Planned instruments averaged 8 percent at the schools, and in-kind donations 1 percent. (Only three of the responding schools reported receiving in-kind gifts.)

Where are the gifts coming from? The schools broke down their major gifts by donor--alumni, parents, nonalumni/friends, corporations, and foundations. Alumni gave the largest proportion of the schools' major gifts. The 15 respondents received an average of 63 percent from alumni. Parents gave an average of 19 percent (this was the highest percentage received from parents by any of the institutional groups in this study); foundations, 12 percent; nonalumni/friends, 4 percent; and corporations, 1 percent (the lowest percentage of any of the institutional groups in the study).

What proportion of the schools' major gifts comes from board members? One school considers that information confidential, and one did not respond. However, 13 reported an average 25 percent of major gifts coming from trustees. When asked for the same information about former board members, 10 schools reported receiving such major gifts; overall they amounted to 7 percent of major gifts for the schools in the sample.

When the schools reported the percentages of major gifts received in cash or convertible securities and various planned gifts, cash or convertible securities made up the largest proportion by far, with an average of 73 percent. Other than bequests at 13 percent, planned gifts were not significant at these independent schools (3 percent from charitable remainder trusts, 2 percent from lead trusts, and 1 percent from pooled income funds). Overall, the schools reported receiving 8 percent of their gifts as combinations of cash or convertible securities and deferred gifts.

Major gift research

These questions surveyed the schools' methods of identifying major donors. When asked whether they considered prospect research important in the overall major gift program, eight out of 15 schools responded that prospect research is very important; five schools considered it important; and two found prospect research somewhat important. No institution responded that it was not important.

There are many methods of prospect research, and the survey mentioned four--referral, geodemographic screening, internal prospect research, and field screening. Each respondent was asked to approximate the percentage of major gift prospects identified by each method. Respondents could also add other methods. Fourteen schools responded, but not every school used every method. In fact, internal prospect research was the only method used by all 14 institutions that answered this question.

Internal prospect research was used to identify 51 percent of the major gift prospects at these institutions. The schools used referral to identify an average of 22 percent; field screening to spot an average 16 percent, and geodemographic screening to identify 4 percent. One school relied on staff knowledge for 80 percent of its major gift prospect identification, while another school claimed "luck" as a factor 15 percent of the time. These two approaches accounted for 7 percent of the major gift prospects at the responding schools.

The size of the prospect research staff significantly affects the research methods used by a school. Seven of the 15 schools have no prospect research staff. The other eight schools have a staff of one to three prospect researchers. Eleven of the 15 schools believe they have insufficient research help while four (all of whom have one to three researchers) feel their research help is adequate. Eleven school have a computerized system for tracking prospects.

When in a campaign, nine of 12 responding schools said their major gift efforts were very intense, and three schools said they were intense. No school responded that efforts were not intense during a campaign.

The same question was asked about major gift efforts one year out of a campaign. Two of the 11 schools responding to this question said their major gift efforts were very intense; two schools said efforts were intense; four reported somewhat intense efforts; and three said efforts were not intense the first year out of a campaign.

Finally, the same question was posed for the schools more than a year after a campaign. Only one of 14 respondent schools reported very intense major gift efforts; two had intense efforts; three reported somewhat intense efforts; and eight said their major gift efforts were not intense after more than a year from the close of the campaign.

The task of evaluating and rating major gift prospects can be handled by a variety of people. The schools estimated the percentages of major gift prospects rated and evaluated by staff, staff and volunteers, and volunteers. Staff and volunteers work together to evaluate about 60 percent of the major donors. Staff working alone (without volunteers) evaluate and rate 37 percent of the prospects. At three schools, volunteers alone evaluate and rate prospects; this accounted for 3 percent of the overall respondent schools' prospect pool.

Major gift staffing and solicitation

Of the 13 schools that responded to the question about structuring the major gift operation, six have an Office of Major/Planned Gifts; four maintain the Office of Major Gifts as a separate unit; one has a separate office for each category--major gifts and planned gifts. One school explained, "Major gifts officer [is] trained in planned giving; planned giving director hitherto served as technical adviser when required [but] maintained separate program for his prospects." Two say that *all* development staff works in one office.

Ten of the 15 schools have one to three major gift officers, but five schools have no major gift officer. At three of these, the director of development is responsible for staffing major gifts, and at one institution a development officer handles that function. (One school did not indicate who handles this function.)

At all but one school, development officers handle 11 or more major gift prospects. At six schools, they handle 51 to 100 prospects; at four, it's over 200; at two, it's 11 to 50; and at one, it's 101 to 200.

Six of the 15 schools are currently in a campaign. Four of the six increased their major gift staff at the start of the campaign. Of the six schools responding to the question, "Will you retain your current level of major gifts staffing at the completion of your campaign?" five hadn't decided yet, and one said yes.

To what degree are those involved in an institution's fund-raising program responsible for securing major gifts? The survey asked the schools to use a one-to-five scale to rate the degree of major gift responsibility of the school head/president, chief development officer, dean, major gift officer, development officers, trustees, volunteers, and faculty members.

The person with the greatest responsibility in securing a major gift, according to the respondent schools, was the school head/president (a weighted average of 4.7 on the five-point scale) with trustees second at 4.2. The next highest rating (3.4) went to the chief development officer and to volunteers. Less important were development officers, who received a rating of 2.9, and major gift officer at 2.5. Faculty and deans were almost equally unimportant (1.1 and .9, respectively).

When asked who secured the top three gifts for the schools in the past five years, the institutions responded as follows: The school head/president alone was responsible for 13 (27 percent) of the 48 largest gifts (averaging $1.56 million) and the head/president with a partner (often a trustee or the Development Committee chair) for another 17 (35 percent) of the largest gifts (averaging $1.94 million). The school head/president's role is even more important when you consider that eight of the megagifts that he or she brought in, alone or with others, were of unspecified size (see tabulation of research results) and thus could not be included in the averages.

Probably because of the smaller staffs at independent schools, trustees and other volunteers play the important part in the "big ask" that chief development officers and major gift officers do at other types of institutions.

Since 1983, 12 of the 15 respondents have increased their use of volunteers in major gift solicitation by an average of 43 percent. Two schools decreased their use of volunteers by 25 percent, and one school no longer uses volunteers in major gift solicitation.

Since 1983 volunteers have secured an average of almost half (46 percent) of all major gifts for the respondent schools. (This was the highest average for volunteers among the institutional groups.) The head brought in an average of 26 percent, and the development staff secured an average of approximately 23 percent. This accounts for 95 percent of the major gifts at the respondent institutions. Comparing the answers to this question with the question reported above about the "big ask" makes it clear that the school head/president is somewhat more involved in soliciting the really large major gifts than in all major gifts.

When asked if more than one person goes on a major gift solicitation call, 12 of 15 schools said yes. Seven of 14 schools that specified the composition of their teams said the most common team is the head with a trustee. Two schools each send the head and the chief development officer, the chief development officer and a trustee, or the chief development officer with another volunteer. One sends the head with other volunteers.

It is often difficult to pinpoint who made the ask, as the comments pointed out. Several people may be involved over the months or years of cultivation. Secondary schools often have much smaller staffs than colleges and universities so one person may play many roles in the process. As one independent school respondent said, "'Staff' implies the collegiate model of more than one person. At the secondary level, we wear more hats so that the number of completed calls and gifts is lower. . . ."

Endowment program

When asked whether the school has a range of named endowments, 14 out of 15 respondents answered yes. Twelve schools listed a minimum requirement for an endowed chair/professorship: Minimums ranged from $250,000 (two schools) to $1 million (five respondents), with four requiring $500,000 and one asking $600,000.

Eight of 13 schools indicated that the minimum endowment is negotiable, often depending on the depth of the donor's affiliation and the likelihood of future gifts from him or her. One respondent explained how the negotiation is handled: "The donor's depth of affiliation and specific giving timetable will always be considered, but we have policies that offer a strong framework from which we try not to stray far."

Seven of 14 respondents do not have multiple levels of faculty positions that can be endowed. Of the seven schools that do, amounts required ranged from $50,000 to $1 million.

The survey asked the schools what percentage of the endowment income for an endowed professorship was used for salaries. Six schools use all of the income for salaries, and two use 75 percent. Other levels mentioned by one school each were 83, 77, and 71 percent. (Most institutions have a policy of spending a set percent of endowment principal--say 5 or 6 percent--on the endowment's purpose; any remainder is retained in the principal to prevent its erosion by inflation. For example, an institution that was receiving a 7 percent yield and spending 5 percent would be using 71 percent of the endowment's income.)

When do the schools fill an endowed professorship? Five fill it when it is fully funded. At two schools the endowment must be at least 50 percent funded, and three have not determined the percentage required to fill the chair or say "it varies." One fills the chair "when the money starts coming in." In the case of a gift subject to life income, only two schools said they would fill the chair at the time of the gift. None of the respondent schools said they would fill the chair at the time of the documented bequest.

Six of 11 schools answering this question market endowments for positions other than full professorships. Options mentioned included instructorships at $250,000, a one-year internship at $250,000, and a fellowship for junior faculty at $500,000.

All but one of the 15 schools actively promote endowments for other purposes or programs. Of those responses, the most frequently listed were scholarships and financial aid with required endowments ranging from $5,000 to $350,000. Three promote endowments for program support, with endowments ranging from $10,000 to "all we can get." Three schools promote endowments from $50,000 to $1 million for faculty development, and two promote endowments at $10,000 for library and book funds.

Naming opportunities

Fourteen of the 15 schools have capital or other naming opportunities, and seven have specific policies regarding these opportunities. One school said the policies are not usually negotiable, but the other schools are willing to negotiate and hold discussions at which the head and/or the trustees meet with the donor to work out the details. Schools that have no policy said that their boards review each situation on a case-by-case basis. One school responded, "As new projects are funded, we decide at that time whether or not naming opportunities would be productive." Another school is "in the midst of developing a policy."

In order to name a building, five schools require that 50 percent of the total cost of a capital project be covered, and three require that 75 percent be covered. One school requires 25 to 50 percent, and another school requires 51 percent.

Some schools include long-term maintenance costs in the projection of the total cost of a capital project. The 11 respondents to this question were almost equally divided when asked if they included long-term maintenance: Six schools do include it, and five do not.

The survey asked if their efforts to raise such an endowment for long-term maintence were working. Responses ranged from "no" and "minimally" to some more positive remarks: One respondent said, "In the middle of a campaign; so far, so good." Another commented, "Buildings are never 'sexy' so gifts are virtually always motivated by the academic ideal for the program to be housed, i.e., athletics or theater. Negotiations for maintenance endowment always continue behind the scenes." A third said, "[The effort to raise a maintenance endowment] has failed in the past. With new program (entire development program changed in 1989), it is working. Endowment for maintenance is almost too high to be palatable, but it is well received by donors."

Of the schools that include long-term maintenance costs in their projections, one school indicated that 50 percent of the total project cost is for maintenance; two schools responded that it ranged from 25 or 30 to 50 percent; one school said 20 percent; and one school put it at 5 percent. Two said that it varied.

Is it easier to raise money for capital projects now than it was in 1983? Nine of the respondents thought it was about the same; four said it was easier; and only one found it more difficult. Of those who said it was easier, three schools found endowment fund raising to be easier than building projects. One school said, "Raising endowment funds [is] easier in the last seven to 10 years. Building funds, not easier, maybe a little harder--really depends on the project." Another said, "Endowment seems to be easier to come by; building [funds] a bit more difficult."

Independent Elementary/Secondary Schools

MAJOR GIFTS DEFINED

1. **What word best describes your larger gifts?** (15 respondents)

Major:	8
Leadership:	6
Special:	0
Other: Strategic	1

2. **What is the minimum gift that qualifies for your lowest major gifts category?** (15 respondents)

$25,000:	8
$50,000:	1
$100,000:	3
Other: $10,000:	3

3. **Has your definition of major gifts levels changed since 1983?** (15 respondents)

Yes:	9
No:	6

4. **If yes, what was your previous definition?** (9 respondents)

- "No previous definition": 2 institutions.
- "$10,000 (one now $25,000; one now $100,000)": 2 institutions.
- "$15,000-$25,000 (now $25,000)."
- "$25,000 (now $10,000)."
- "$50,000 (now 100,000)."
- "Not sure, probably $50,000 (now $100,000)."
- "No definition until 1989. New definition: leadership, $100,000 and above; major, 25,000."

5. **What percentage of your major gifts do you receive in each of the following forms?** (14 respondents)

Cash:	10% - 1
	20% - 1
	25% - 1
	30% - 1
	40% - 3
	50% - 2
	75% - 2
	80% - 1
	85% - 1
	90% - 1

Stocks:	10% - 2
	15% - 1
	18% - 1
	20% - 2
	30% - 1
	35% - 1
	50% - 1
	55% - 1
	60% - 1
	75% - 2
	89% - 1
In-kind:	0% - 11
	2% - 2
	5% - 1
Planned instruments:	0% - 5
	1% - 1
	3% - 1
	5% - 3
	10% - 1
	20% - 1
	30% - 1
	40% - 1

6. **What percentage is received from:** (14 respondents)

Alumni:	20% - 1
	42% - 1
	50% - 1
	55% - 1
	60% - 4
	70% - 1
	75% - 1
	80% - 1
	82% - 1
	85% - 1
	87% - 1
Parents:	5% - 1
	8% - 1
	10% - 2
	13% - 1
	15% - 2
	20% - 2
	25% - 1
	30% - 3
	33% - 1
Nonalumni/friends:	0% - 8
	5% - 3
	10% - 1
	15% - 2

Corporations:	0% - 8
	1% - 3
	2% - 1
	5% - 2
Foundations:	0% - 2
	1% - 1
	4% - 1
	5% - 1
	10% - 4
	13% - 1
	19% - 1
	20% - 2
	50% - 1

7. **What percentage is received from:** (14 respondents)

Board members:	5% - 1
	15% - 2
	20% - 3
	25% - 2
	30% - 2
	40% - 2
	60% - 1
	Confidential - 1
Former board members:	0% - 3
	1% - 1
	3% - 1
	5% - 1
	10% - 4
	15% - 2
	20% - 1
	N/A - 1

8. **Of the major gifts received, what percentage comes in the form of the following:** (14 respondents)

a) Pooled income fund:	0% or see "f" - 9
	.15% - 1
	1% - 1
	2% - 1
	4% - 1
	10% - 1
b) Lead trusts:	0% or see "f" - 10
	1% - 2
	3% - 1
	20% - 1

c) Charitable remainder trusts:	0% or see "f" - 7
	.1% - 1
	1% - 1
	4% - 1
	5% - 2
	10% - 2
d) Bequests:	0% or see "f" - 2
	.75% - 1
	1% - 2
	5% - 1
	8% - 1
	10% - 3
	30% - 2
	31% - 1
	50% - 1
e) Cash or convertible securities:	0% or see "f" - 1
	30% - 1
	48% - 1
	60% - 1
	70% - 1
	80% - 2
	85% - 2
	90% - 1
	95% - 1
	98% - 2
	99% - 1
f) Combination:	0% - 11
	5% - 1
	13% - 1
	100% - 1
g) Other:	0% - 14

9. **If the answer is "f," please indicate your estimated percentage received as:**

a) Cash:	65% - 1
	75% - 1
	90% - 1
b) Planned instruments:	35% - 1
	25% - 1
	10% - 1

Other comments:

- "Using life insurance as planned instrument, mostly."
- "Our major gifts/capital giving program is still maturing so we do not have statistics at hand. All of these numbers are based on a quick review of 1990-91 gifts and may be less than accurate."
- "No major gifts program existed here until 1989 when we implemented a systematized approach for the first time."

MAJOR GIFT RESEARCH

10. **How important do you consider prospect research to be in your major gifts?** (15 respondents)

Very important:	8
Important:	5
Somewhat important:	2
Not important:	0

11. **Approximately what percentage of your major gifts prospects was identified by each method?** (14 respondents)

Referral:	0% - 1
	5% - 2
	10% - 4
	20% - 2
	25% - 2
	40% - 1
	50% - 1
	80% - 1
Geodemographic screening:	0% - 8
	5% - 3
	10% - 1
	15% - 2
Internal prospect research:	10% - 2
	15% - 1
	20% - 2
	45% - 1
	50% - 2
	65% - 2
	80% - 1
	90% - 2
	100% - 1
Field screening:	0% - 5
	5% - 1
	10% - 1
	25% - 3
	30% - 2
	40% - 2

Other:	Staff knowledge:	80% - 1
	Luck:	15% - 1

12. **What is the size of your prospect research staff?** (15 respondents)

None:	7
1-3:	8
4-6:	0
7-9:	0
10 or more:	0

13. **Do you feel that you have adequate research help?** (15 respondents)

Yes:	4
No:	11

14. **Do you have a computerized system for tracking prospects?** (15 respondents)

Yes:	11
No:	4

15. **Please rate the intensity of your major gifts effort by circling the appropriate number:** (15 respondents)

In a campaign:	
Very intense:	9
Intense:	3
Somewhat intense:	0
Not intense:	0
Not ranked:	3
First year out of campaign:	
Very intense:	2
Intense:	2
Somewhat intense:	4
Not intense:	3
Not ranked:	4
More than one year out:	
Very intense:	1
Intense:	2
Somewhat intense:	3
Not intense:	8
Not ranked:	1

16. Approximately what percentage of your major gifts prospects are evaluated and rated by: (15 respondents)

Volunteers (alone):	0% - 12
	10% - 2
	30% - 1
Staff (alone):	0% - 6
	10% - 1
	20% - 1
	40% - 1
	44% - 1
	75% - 2
	90% - 1
	95% - 1
	100% - 1
Staff with volunteers:	0% - 1
	5% - 1
	10% - 1
	25% - 2
	50% - 1
	55% - 1
	60% - 1
	70% - 1
	100% - 6

Please include any comments.

- "We are between methods as our half-time researcher recently left. We will probably reinvest that salary, plus some, to use geodemographical screening of our highest prospects who will define our pyramid."

MAJOR GIFT STAFFING AND SOLICITATION

17. Is your major gifts operation structured as: (13 respondents)

a) Office of Major Gifts:	4
b) Office of Major/Planned Gifts:	6
c) Separate offices for each category:	1
Other: All in one office:	2

18. If separate offices, describe briefly how planned giving interfaces with other major gift work?

- "We have a director of major gifts who reports to the director of development."
- "Major gifts officer trained in planned giving; planned giving director hitherto served as technical adviser when required; maintained separate program for his prospects."

19. Do you have one or more major gifts officers currently working in your office? (15 respondents)

Yes:	10
No:	5

20. If yes, how many? (10 respondents)

1-3:	10
4-6:	0
7-9:	0
10 or more:	0

21. If no, who is responsible for staffing major gifts?

Head and Director of Development:	1
Director of Development:	3

22. How many major gifts donors and prospects are managed by one development officer? (14 respondents)

10 or fewer:	1
11-50:	2
51-100:	6
101-200:	1
over 200:	4

23. Are you currently in a campaign? (15 respondents)

Yes:	6
No:	9

24. If yes, did you hire or increase your major gifts staff at the start of the campaign? (6 respondents)

Yes:	4
No:	2

25. **Will you retain your current level of major gifts staffing at the completion of your campaign?** (6 respondents)

Yes:	1
No, will reduce it:	0
No, will eliminate it:	0
Don't know yet:	5

26. **To what degree is each person responsible for securing a major gift?** (15 respondents)

President: (weighted average 4.7)	
1:	0
2:	0
3:	1
4:	3
5:	11
Chief development officer: (3.4)	
1:	0
2:	1
3:	2
4:	6
5:	5
Not ranked:	1
Dean: (.9)	
1:	9
2:	1
3:	1
4:	0
5:	0
Not ranked:	4
Major gifts officer: (2.5)	
1:	1
2:	2
3:	3
4:	2
5:	3
Not ranked:	4
Development officers: (2.9)	
1:	2
2:	3
3:	5
4:	5
5:	0
Not ranked:	0

Trustees: (4.2)

1:	0
2:	0
3:	3
4:	6
5:	6
Not ranked:	0

Volunteers (alumni or other): (3.4)

1:	0
2:	3
3:	6
4:	3
5:	3
Not ranked:	0

Faculty member: (1.1)

1:	12
2:	1
3:	1
4:	0
5:	0
Not ranked:	1

27. Of your institution's top three gifts in the past five years, who did the asking?

Gift #1: Amount:	Title of Asker:
$5,000,000	Headmaster/CDO
$5,000,000	Headmaster/CDO
$5,000,000	Headmaster
$3,500,000	President/Headmaster
$2,500,000	Pres/BOT
$1,500,000	Spontaneous by DCC
$1,000,000	Trustee Camp. Vol.
$1,000,000	President
$940,000	Trustee
$500,000	Head/Chair, BOT
$355,000	Headmaster
$250,000	Headmaster
$150,000	Development Director
undefined	Headmaster
undefined	Trustee/Headmaster
undefined	President

Gift #2: Amount:	Title of Asker:
$5,000,000	Pres. of BOT/CDO
$3,600,000	Trustee/Headmaster
$3,200,000	Head/DCC
$3,000,000	Trustee
$2,500,000	Headmaster
$1,700,000	Unexpected Bequest
$1,000,000	Campaign Chair
$910,000	Trustee/Headmaster
$500,000	Headmaster
$347,000	Headmaster/Other
$100,000	Headmaster
$100,000	Bishop
$100,000	Trustee
undefined	Trustee/Headmaster
undefined	President
undefined	Headmaster

Gift #3: Amount:	Title of Asker:
$4,000,000	Trustee
$2,800,000	Headmaster
$2,000,000	Trustee
$1,000,000	Head/DCC
$1,000,000	Chair, CC/Brd. Chair
$1,000,000	Trustee/School Head
$850,000	Trustee Emeritus
$500,000	Head/Dir. of Dev.
$300,000	Director of Dev.
$300,000	Major Gifts Officer
$100,000	Headmaster/Trustee
$85,000	Bequest, Trustee
$20,000	Rector/President
undefined	Headmaster
undefined	Trustee/Headmaster
undefined	Director of Dev.

28. a) **Since 1983, has your use of volunteers in major gifts solicitation increased or decreased?** (15 respondents)

Increased:	12
Decreased:	3

28. **b) Since 1983, what is your estimated percentage of increase or decrease of use of volunteers in major gifts solicitation?** (15 respondents)

5% increase:	0
10% increase:	3
25% increase:	1
50% increase:	6
100% increase:	2
5% decrease:	0
10% decrease:	0
25% decrease:	2
50% decrease:	0
100% decrease:	1

29. **Since 1983, approximately what percentage of major gifts were secured by volunteers?** (15 respondents)

10%:	1
25%:	2
50%:	5
Other: specify:	
0%:	1
37%:	1
60%:	1
65%:	1
75%:	3

30. **Since 1983, approximately what percentage of major gifts were secured by the president?** (14 respondents)

10%:	6
25%:	4
50%:	4

31. **Since 1983, approximately what percentage of major gifts were secured by the development staff?** (15 respondents)

10%:	3
25%:	7
50%:	1
Other, specify:	
75%:	1
15%:	1
< 10%:	1
0%:	1

32. Do you usually send more than one solicitor on a major gifts solicitation call? (15 respondents)

Yes:	12
No:	3

33. If yes, what is the most usual combination? (14 respondents)

President/Trustee:	7
President/Chief Development Officer:	2
President/Other Volunteer:	1
Chief Development Officer/Trustee:	2
Chief Development Officer/Other Volunteers:	2

Please include any other comments:

- "Who asks or secures major gifts is not always easily identifiable. May be several asks or people securing the gift."
- "The director of development is also the chief development officer, supervising alumni, parents relations, and public relations, publications, annual giving, and staff management. Only approximately 25 percent of the incumbent's time is spent on major gifts identification, cultivation, and solicitation."
- "They staff the solicitation for the volunteers who do the ask."
- "Small office at an independent school."
- "We are just gearing up for a capital campaign; this will be our first all-out effort toward a campaign."
- "'Staff' implies the collegiate model of more than one person. At the secondary level, we wear more hats so the number of completed calls and gifts is lower, at least where I work."
- "Program staff-driven; developing strong volunteer network has been slow. This is a major challenge to new program."

ENDOWMENT PROGRAM

34. Do you have a range of named endowments for endowed funds? (15 respondents)

Yes:	14
No:	1

35. If yes, what is your minimum for an endowed professorship? (15 respondents)

N/A:	3
$250,000:	2
$500,000:	4
$600,000:	1
$1,000,000:	5

36. Is your minimum negotiable? (13 respondents)

Yes:	8
No:	5

37. If yes, please explain to what degree.

- "The limit hasn't been challenged."
- "Depending on relationship with donor and the likelihood of additional gifts from that individual. Reviewed by major gifts committee."
- "Depends on the donor and future gift potential."
- "Circumstances may dictate; no explicit constraints are put on the solicitor."
- "We use an accumulative option--the opening gift can vary."
- "We only moved the number up to $500,000 during our centennial campaign; before that, it was as low as $100,000."
- "We seek at least 50 percent of fully funded amount when it is established and plan to secure the remaining amount in short-term future."
- "The donor's depth of affiliation and specific giving timetable will always be considered, but we have policies that offer a strong framework from which we try not to stray far."

38. Do you have multiple levels of faculty positions that can be endowed? (14 respondents)

Yes:	7
No:	7

39. If yes, please list them with the amount required for endowment

Position	Endowment Required
Chair	$1,000,000
Faculty Chair	$250,000-$500,000
Headmaster	$1,000,000
Instructorship	$500,000
Instructorship	$250,000
Intern	$300,000
Mastership	$250,000
Master Teacher Chair	$50,000
Other	$500,000
Professorship	$500,000
Senior Master Chair	$50,000

40. What percentage of the endowment income for an endowed professorship is used for salaries? (11 respondents)

100%:	6
83%:	1
77%:	1
75%:	2
71%:	1

41. **When do you fill your endowed professorships?** (12 respondents)

At time of pledge:	0
50% funded:	2
100% funded:	5
Other, specify:	
Not determined:	2
When the money starts coming in:	1
Varies:	1
When money equals salary:	1

42. **Do you fill a chair now for a gift subject to life income?** (10 respondents)

Yes:	2
No:	8

43. **Do you fill a chair now for a documented bequest provision?** (9 respondents)

Yes:	0
No:	9

44. **Do you market endowments for other than full professorships?** (11 respondents)

Yes:	6
No:	5

45. **If yes, please list for what positions and the endowment required:**

Position	Endowment Required
Fellowship for Junior Faculty	$500,000
Full Scholarship	$300,000
Graduate Study	$100,000
Instructorships	$250,000
Naming Opportunity	$10,000
One-year Internship	$250,000
Partial Scholarship	$50,000
Program Funds	$50,000
Sabbatical Leave	$500,000
Scholarship Fund	$100,000
Teaching Fund	$200,000
Teaching Sabbatical	undefined

46. Do you actively promote endowments for other purposes or programs? (15 respondents)

Yes:	14
No:	1

47. If yes, please list for what purpose or program and the size of the endowment required:

Purpose or Program	Endowment Required
Academic Program Support	Negotiable
Building Maintenance	60% building value
Endow a Student	$5,000-$200,000
Faculty Development	$1,000,000
Faculty Development	$50,000
Faculty Support	Negotiable
Financial Aid	$250,000
Horse and Campus Program	All we can get
Library Book Fund	$10,000
Maintenance	Depends on need
Maintenance Reserve	Open
New Student Center	$2,500,000
Prize and Book Funds	$10,000
Program Support	Depends on need
Programmatic	$10,000
Scholarship	$300,000
Scholarship--Full	$300,000
Scholarship Fund	$300,000
Scholarship--Boarding	$250,000
Scholarships--Day	$150,000
Scholarship	$100,000
Scholarship--Full	$200,000
Scholarship	$50,000
Scholarship	$10,000
Scholarship	$250,000
Scholarship	$150,000
Scholarship--Minimum	$20,000
Scholarship--Full	$350,000
Student Financial Aid	$25,000

NAMING OPPORTUNITIES

48. Do you have capital or other naming opportunities? (15 respondents)

Yes:	14
No:	1

49. **Do you have a specific set of policies regarding naming opportunities?** (15 respondents)

Yes:	7
No:	8

50. **If you have a policy, to what extent is it negotiable?**

- "It is always negotiable within certain guidelines."
- "Must be discussed with head, board, and development director."
- "Not usually negotiable."
- "Somewhat, based on discussion with head, trustees, and donor."
- "Seems to be very negotiable. Usually at least 50 percent of building value; $25,000 or more for named endowment."
- "Somewhat."
- "Has been very negotiable in the past; we are working to establish firm guidelines."

51. **If you have no specific policy in that regard, what is your practice?**

- "Only one situation has arisen; it was approved by board action."
- "Depends on present situation. Planned gifts cannot be used for naming opportunities until realized. Bricks and mortar naming opportunities based on 75-100 percent cost of project."
- "Fifty-one percent of funding provided by donor who is naming."
- "Case-by-case evaluations with final decision by board."
- "We have just begun and use a list of areas with amounts."
- "As new projects are funded, we decide at that time whether or not naming opportunities would be productive."
- "We are in the midst of developing a policy."

52. **What percentage of the total cost of a capital project must be covered to name a building?** (10 respondents)

50%:	5
75%:	3
Other:	
25-50%:	1
51%:	1

53. **Do you include long-term maintenance costs in this projection?** (11 respondents)

Yes:	6
No:	5

54. **In practice, is your effort to raise such an endowment working?**

Please explain.

- "Too soon to tell."
- "No."
- "No, but it has not worked in two mini-campaigns; a very hard sell."
- "Yes, some success."
- "Not yet."
- "In the middle of a campaign; so far, so good."
- "Varied success."
- "Minimally."
- "Buildings are never 'sexy' so gifts are virtually always motivated by the academic ideal for the program to be housed, e.g., athletics or theater. Negotiations for maintenance endowment always continue behind the scenes."
- "Has failed in the past. With new program (entire development program changed in 1989), it is working. Endowment for maintenance is almost too high to be palatable, but it is well received by donors."

55. **If yes, what is the percentage of the total projected endowment?** (7 respondents)

5%:	1
20%:	1
25-50%:	1
30-50%:	1
50%:	1
Varies:	2

56. **Since 1983, have you found fund raising for capital projects to be:** (14 respondents)

Easier:	4
More difficult:	1
About the same:	9

Please explain.

- "Raising endowment funds easier in the last seven to 10 years. Building funds, not easier, maybe even a little harder--really depends on the project."
- "Prior to the 1980s the emphasis on major gifts efforts was for endowment, so donors were receptive to supporting a new priority."
- "Just beginning."
- "Endowment seems to be easier to come by; building a bit more difficult."
- "As more demands/requests are made of major gifts prospects, it is more difficult to explain why our needs are still essential."

- "The percentage of people who can make major gifts is so small anyway, our pyramid's shape doesn't change that much with the economy. We're usually assuming 90/10 or 85/15 split, hoping that it does not get too skewed at either extreme."
- "Institution has done well in past; far fewer capital projects now, but they are popular with donors."

INSTITUTIONAL INFORMATION

57. For what type of institution do you work?

Private/independent:	15

58. Is your institution church-affiliated?

Yes:	2
No:	13

59. Is your institution:

An elementary and/or secondary school:	15

60. What is the undergraduate student enrollment at your institution?

Under 2,000:	15

RESPONDENT INSTITUTIONS

Anonymous
The Brooks School
Chatham Hall
Culver Academy
Deerfield Academy
Gilman School
Hotchkiss School
Mercersburg Academy
Milton Academy
Miss Porter's School
Northfield Mount Hermon School
Phillips Exeter Academy
Poly Prep Country Day School
The Thacher School
Westminster School

Appendix

CASE

COUNCIL FOR ADVANCEMENT AND SUPPORT OF EDUCATION

Office of the President

July 30, 1991

Dear Colleague:

I need your help!

Your institution's participation in a new study of major gifts is needed to document how major gift fund raising has changed in the past seven years.

We need to update the information that yours and approximately 70 other institutions and schools furnished in the 1984 study, The Quest for Major Gifts, compiled by the late Addison L. Winship II.

CASE, in partnership with Marts & Lundy, Inc., is working with Anne W. Altizer, a fund raiser for the National 4-H Council and graduate student at the University of Maryland, to update this study.

I ask you to take the time to respond to this survey now--it can be completed by you and a gift accounting staff member without great difficulty. Please send your completed survey in the enclosed return envelope by September 13 to:

Anne W. Altizer
CASE
11 Dupont Circle, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036-1261

Thanks in advance for your cooperation. Of course a complimentary copy of the study will be sent to you as soon as it is in published form.

With best wishes.

Cordially,

Peter McE. Buchanan

P.S. If you have questions, please telephone Ruth Stadius at (202) 328-5929.

Enclosure: Survey and return envelope

SUITE 400 · 11 DUPONT CIRCLE · WASHINGTON, DC 20036-1261

(202) 328-5900 FAX (202) 387-4973

We appreciate your time given to completing this questionnaire. Please answer the questions as thoroughly as possible.
We will send you the results of the study in the fall.

MAJOR GIFTS DEFINED

1) What word best describes your larger gifts?

☐ Major ☐ Leadership ☐ Special ☐ Other (specify) _____

2) What is the minimum gift that qualifies for your lowest major gift category?

☐ $25,000 ☐ $50,000 ☐ $100,000 ☐ Other (specify) _____

3) Has your definition of major gift levels changed since 1984?

☐ Yes ☐ No

4) If yes, what was your previous definition?

_____

_____

_____

5) What percentage of your major gifts do you receive in each of the following forms?

Cash _____ % Stocks _____ % In-kind _____ %

Planned instruments _____ % Other (specify) _____ _____ %

6) What percentage is received from:

Alumni _____ % Parents _____ % Nonalumni/Friends _____ % Corporations _____ % Foundations _____ %

7) What percentage is received from:

Board members (*) _____ % Former board members _____ %

(*) Please think of boards as including Board of Trustees, Board of Regents, advisory councils, etc. Board members may be alumni or nonalumni.

8) Of the major gifts received, what percentage comes in the form of the following:

a. Pooled income fund _____ %
b. Lead trusts _____ %
c. Charitable remainder trusts _____ %
d. Bequests _____ %
e. Cash (or convertible securities) _____ %
f. Combination of above _____ %

9) If the answer is "f," please indicate your estimate of the percentage received as:

a. Cash _____ %
b. Planned instrument _____ %

Please add anything else you feel is important in your definition of a major gifts program and attach brochures, tables, examples of printed materials, etc.

MAJOR GIFT RESEARCH

10) How important do you consider prospect research to be in your major gifts?

☐ Very important ☐ Important ☐ Somewhat important ☐ Not important

11) Approximately what percentage of your major gift prospects was identified by each method?

Referral _____ % Geodemographic screening _____ % Internal prospect research _____ %

Field screening _____ % Other (specify) _____ _____ %

12) What is the size of your prospect research staff (full-time equivalents)?

☐ No research staff ☐ 4-6 ☐ 10 or more
☐ 1-3 ☐ 7-9

13) Do you feel that you have adequate research help?

☐ Yes ☐ No

14) Do you have a computerized system for tracking prospects?

☐ Yes ☐ No

15) Please rate the intensity of your major gifts effort by circling the appropriate number:

	Very intense	*Intense*	*Somewhat intense*	*Not intense*
In a campaign	1	2	3	4
First year out of campaign	1	2	3	4
More than one year out	1	2	3	4

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

16) Approximately what percentage of your major gift prospects are evaluated and rated by:

Volunteers _____ % Staff _____ % Staff working with volunteers _____ %

Other (specify) _____ _____ %

Please include anything else that you feel is important to major gift research.

MAJOR GIFTS STAFFING AND SOLICITATION

17) Is your major gift operation structured as

- ☐ a. Office of major gifts
- ☐ b. Office of major/planned gifts
- ☐ c. Separate offices for each category

18) If separate offices for each category, please describe briefly how planned giving interfaces with other major gift work.

_____

_____

_____

19) Do you have one or more major gift officers currently working in your office?

☐ Yes ☐ No

20) If yes, how many?

☐ 1-3 ☐ 4-6 ☐ 7-9 ☐ 10 or more

21) If no, who is responsible for staffing major gifts?

_____

22) How many major gift donors and prospects are managed by one development officer?

☐ 10 or fewer ☐ 51-100 ☐ over 200

☐ 11-50 ☐ 101-200

23) Are you currently in a capital campaign?

☐ Yes ☐ No

24) If yes, did you hire or increase your major gifts staff at the start of the campaign?

☐ Yes ☐ No

25) Will you retain your current level of major gifts staffing after the completion of your campaign?

☐ Yes ☐ No, will reduce it

☐ No, will eliminate it ☐ Don't know yet

26) To what degree is each person responsible for securing a major gift?

	Very		*Moderate*		*Not at all*
President	5	4	3	2	1
Chief development officer	5	4	3	2	1
Dean	5	4	3	2	1
Major gift officer(s)	5	4	3	2	1
Development officer(s)	5	4	3	2	1
Trustee	5	4	3	2	1
Volunteers (alumni or other)	5	4	3	2	1
Faculty member	5	4	3	2	1

27) Of your institution's top three gifts in the past five years, who did the "asking"?

	Amount of gift	*Title of person who did the "asking"*
Gift #1	$ _____	_____
Gift #2	$ _____	_____
Gift #3	$ _____	_____

28) a. Since 1983, has your use of volunteers in major gift solicitation increased or decreased?

Increased ☐ Yes ☐ No Decreased ☐ Yes ☐ No

b. Since 1983, what is your estimated percentage of increase or decrease of the use of volunteers in major gift solicitations?

☐ 5% increase ☐ 10% increase ☐ 25% increase ☐ 50% increase ☐ 100% increase

☐ 5% decrease ☐ 10% decrease ☐ 25% decrease ☐ 50% decrease ☐ 100% decrease

29) Since 1983, approximately what percentage of major gifts were secured by volunteers?

☐ 10% ☐ 25% ☐ 50% ☐ Other (specify) _____ _____ %

30) Since 1983, approximately what percentage of major gifts were secured by the president?

☐ 10% ☐ 25% ☐ 50% ☐ Other (specify) _____ _____ %

31) Since 1983, approximately what percentage of major gifts were secured by the development staff?

☐ 10% ☐ 25% ☐ 50% ☐ Other (specify) _____ _____ %

32) Do you usually send more than one solicitor on a major gift solicitation call?

☐ Yes ☐ No

33) If yes, what is the most usual combination?

☐ President and trustee
☐ President and chief development officer
☐ President and other volunteer
☐ Chief development officer and trustee
☐ Chief development officer and volunteer

Please include anything else that you feel is important about your major gifts staff.

ENDOWMENT PROGRAM

34) Do you have a range of named opportunities for endowed funds?

☐ Yes ☐ No

35) If yes, what is your minimum for an endowed professorship? $_____

36) Is your minimum negotiable?

☐ Yes ☐ No

37) If yes, please explain to what degree.

_____

_____

_____

38) Do you have multiple levels of faculty positions that can be endowed?

☐ Yes ☐ No

39) If yes, please list them with the amount required for endowment.

_____

_____

_____

40) What percentage of the endowment income for an endowed professorship is used for salaries? _____ %

41) When do you fill your endowed professorships?

☐ At the time of pledge ☐ When 50% funded ☐ When 100% funded
☐ Other (specify) _____

42) Do you fill a chair now for a gift subject to life income?

☐ Yes ☐ No

43) Do you fill a chair now for a documented bequest provision?

☐ Yes ☐ No

44) Do you market endowments for other than full professorships?

☐ Yes ☐ No

45) If yes, please list for what position and the endowment required.

Position	*Endowment required*
_____	$ _____
_____	$ _____
_____	$ _____

46) Do you actively promote endowments for other purposes or programs?

☐ Yes ☐ No

47) If yes, please list for what purpose or program and the size of endowment required.

Purpose or program	*Endowment required*
_____	$ _____
_____	$ _____
_____	$ _____

Please include anything that you feel is important to define your endowment program.

NAMING OPPORTUNITIES

48) Do you have capital or other naming opportunities (e.g., buildings, labs, studios, athletic positions)?

☐ Yes ☐ No

49) Do you have a specific set of policies regarding naming opportunities?

☐ Yes ☐ No

50) If you have a policy, to what extent is it negotiable?

_____

_____

_____

51) If you have no specific policy in that regard, what is your practice?

_____

_____

_____

52) What percentage of the total cost of a capital project must be covered to name a building? _____ %

53) Do you include long-term maintenance costs in this projection?

☐ Yes ☐ No

54) In practice, is your effort to raise such an endowment working? Please explain.

_____

_____

_____

55) If yes, what is the percentage of the total project endowment? _____ %

56) Since 1983, have you found fund raising for capital projects to be:

☐ Easier ☐ More difficult ☐ About the same

Please explain.

_____

_____

_____

INSTITUTIONAL INFORMATION

57) For what type of institution do you work?

☐ Private/Independent ☐ Public

☐ Other (specify) _____

58) Is your institution church-affiliated?

☐ Yes ☐ No

59) Is your institution:

☐ An elementary and/or secondary school

☐ A two-year college

☐ A four-year college, baccalaureate emphasis

☐ A four-year plus graduate programs and/or professional schools

☐ A graduate and/or professional institution only

☐ A research university

60) What is the undergraduate student enrollment at your institution?

☐ Under 2,000 ☐ 2,000-4,999 ☐ 5,000-9,999

☐ 10,000-14,999 ☐ 15,000-19,999 ☐ 20,000-24,999

☐ 25,000 or more

Name: _____ Title: _____

Institution: _____ Address: _____

City, State, ZIP: _____

Thank you for your help. Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope to: Anne Altizer, CASE, Suite 400, 11 Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036-1261.

CASE

Council for Advancement and Support of Education

1 Dupont Circle Washington DC

172